

PROCEEDINGS

Thirty-Fourth Anniversary Conference

**National Association of Student
Personnel Administrators**

**The Broadmoor Hotel
Colorado Springs, Colorado**

April 2, 3, 4, 5

1952

P R O C E E D I N G S

Thirty-Fourth Anniversary Conference

of the

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT
PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS

President President A. Blair Knapp, Denison
University
Vice President Dean Robert M. Strozier, University
of Chicago
Vice President Dean Hurford E. Stone, University of
California
Secretary-Treasurer ... Dean Fred H. Turner, University of
Illinois

Executive Committee: The Officers and

Dean Wesley P. Lloyd, Brigham Young University
Dean Arden O. French, Louisiana State University
Dean Fred H. Weaver, University of North Carolina
Director George E. Davis, Purdue University
Dean Francis R. B. Godolphin, Princeton University
Dean Laurence C. Woodruff, University of Kansas

Held at

The Broadmoor
and
Colorado College

Colorado Springs, Colorado

April 2, 3, 4, 5, 1952

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>P a g e</u>
WEDNESDAY EVENING SESSION	
April 2, 1952	
Invocation	1
Greetings - Dean Adams	2
Response - Dean Nowotny	3
Address - Dr. Glenn A. Olds	6
Announcements	20
Discussion of Dr. Olds' Address	21
THURSDAY MORNING SESSION	
April 3, 1952	
Address -	
"Discussion of Relations Between the Dean and the College Psychiatrist -- Areas of Mutual Interest" - Dr. Wedge	32
"Potential Problem Areas" - Dr. Farnsworth .	39
"The Psychiatrist and the Dean -- Past, Present and Future" -Dean Bowditch	47
Discussion - Dean Hunt	52
Discussion of Panel Addresses	58
THURSDAY LUNCHEON SESSION	
April 3, 1952	
Introductions	82
President's Address - President Knapp	84
THURSDAY AFTERNOON SESSION	
April 3, 1952	
Motion re Greetings to Deans Park & Hubbell ..	95
Briefing for Conference No. I - Dean Haack ...	96
Announcements	103
THURSDAY AFTERNOON - CONFERENCE NO. I	
April 3, 1952	
Group II	106
Group IV	122

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>P a g e</u>
THURSDAY EVENING SESSION	
April 3, 1952	
Announcements	132
Reports -	
Commission I - Dean Spathelf	133
Commission II - Dean Newhouse	161
Commission V - Dean Piskor	168
FRIDAY MORNING SESSION	
April 4, 1952	
Reports -	
Commission III - Dean Alden	175
President Pitman	184
Commission IV - Dean Williamson	188
Introductions	200
Motion re Report of Commission I	200
FRIDAY LUNCHEON SESSION	
April 4, 1952	
Address -	
Dean Strozier	216
Dr. Cherrington	221
Dean Lloyd	224
FRIDAY AFTERNOON SESSION	
April 4, 1952	
Announcements	236
Report -	
Committee on Nominations and Place	236
Election of Officers	239
Committee on Resolutions	240
Address - Mr. Dentzer	247
BANQUET SESSION - FRIDAY EVENING	
April 4, 1952	
Invocation	252
Remarks -	
President Knapp	252
Toastmaster Tate	253
Dean Adams	254
Dean Davis	255

TABLE OF CONTENTSP a g e

BANQUET SESSION - FRIDAY EVENING (Cont'd.)

April 4, 1952

Address - Dr. Albert C. Jacobs	256
Introductions	266

SATURDAY MORNING SESSION

April 5, 1952

Announcements	267
Resolutions	267
Adjournment	269

APPENDIX A

Report of the Secretary	270
Report of the Treasurer	276

APPENDIX B

Roster of Attendance at Colorado Springs Meeting	277
---	-----

APPENDIX C

Roster of Ladies Group	282
------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX D

Summary of Previous Meetings	283
------------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX E

Roster of Members	284
Honorary Member	292
Emeritus Deans	292

P R O G R A M

Wednesday, April 2, 1952

- 9:00 A.M. Registration -- Mezzanine Floor.
- 2:00 P.M. Meeting of Executive Committee -- North Lake Room.
- 2:30 P.M. Meetings of Commissions:
- Commission I - Inquire at Registration Desk.
 - Commission II - Inquire at Registration Desk.
 - Commission III - Inquire at Registration Desk.
 - Commission IV - Inquire at Registration Desk.
 - Commission V - Inquire at Registration Desk.
- 2:30 P.M. Orientation Meeting for new Deans and Directors who are attending the Conference for the first time -- Broadmoor Theater.
- Chairman: Dean Donfred H. Gardner, University of Akron.
- Members of Panel:
- Dean E. L. Cloyd, North Carolina State College.
 - Assistant Dean D. A. DeMarino, Pa. State College.
 - Junior Dean W. S. Guthrie, Ohio State University.
 - Director M. D. Helser, Iowa State College.
 - Dean Everett Hunt, Swarthmore College.
 - Assistant Dean Carl W. Knox, Northern Ill. State Col.
 - Dean L. K. Neidlinger, Dartmouth College.
 - Associate Dean W. B. Rea, University of Michigan.
 - Dean J. J. Somerville, Ohio Wesleyan University.
 - Dean T. J. Thompson, University of Nebraska
- 7:30 P.M. Opening Session of the 34th Anniversary Conference -- Broadmoor Theater, President A. Blair Knapp, Denison University, presiding.
- Invocation -- Dean E. F. Bosworth, Oberlin College.
- Announcements -- Dean Juan Reid, Colorado College.
- Welcome -- Major General William H. Gill, President, Colorado College.
- Response -- Dean Arno Nowotny, University of Texas.
- Address -- "How Can We Effectively Develop a Sense of Higher Standards of Personal Integrity and Individual Responsibility in the University and College Community" -- Dr. Glenn A. Olds, Chaplain, University of Denver.
- Informal Reception -- The Ballroom; refreshments and entertainment.

Thursday, April 3, 1952

- 8:00 A.M. Registration continued -- Mezzanine.
- NOTE: Organization meeting for wives in attendance will be held at 10:00 A.M. on Thursday morning in the Green Room. The ladies' program will be announced at that time.

Thursday, April 3, 1952 (Cont'd.)

- 9:00 A.M. Second General Session -- Broadmoor Theater, President A. Blair Knapp presiding.
 Address -- "Discussion of Relations Between the Dean and the College Psychiatrist--Areas of Mutual Interest," Doctor Bryant Wedge, University Health Service, University of Chicago.
 Address -- "Potential Problem Areas," Doctor Dana Farnsworth, Director, Health Service, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
 Discussion -- Dean Erich A. Walter, University of Michigan, Moderator.
 Two Dean-Psychiatrist Teams:
 Doctor Wedge-Dean Robert M. Strozier, Univ. of Chicago
 Doctor Farnsworth-Dean E. Francis Bowditch, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- 12:30 P.M. Luncheon Session -- Main Dining Room.
 Presiding -- Dean H. E. Stone, University of California.
 Speaker -- President A. Blair Knapp, "The President's Address"
- 2:30 P.M. Third General Session -- Broadmoor Theater, Dean Robert M. Strozier presiding.
 Briefing for Conference No. I, "How Can We Effectively Develop a Higher Standard of Personal Integrity and Individual Responsibility in the University and College Community."
 Counselor -- Dean Arno J. Haack, Washington University.
- 3:00 P.M. Conference No. I. By sizes of institutions.
 See Chart on page x for group assignments, places of group meetings, chairmen, recorders, and interrogators.
- 7:30 P.M. Fourth General Session -- Broadmoor Theater.
 Presiding -- President A. Blair Knapp.
 Reports of the Special Commissions by the Chairmen:
 Commission I. Professional Relationships -- Dean Victor F. Spathelf, Wayne University.
 Commission II. Principles and Professional Ethics -- Dean Dean Newhouse, Case Institute of Technology.
 Commission III. Development and Training of Student Personnel Administrators -- Assistant Dean J. Leslie Rollins, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration; also, Training Men for College Administration -- President Paul M. Pitman, College of Idaho.

Thursday, April 3, 1952 (Cont'd.)

- Commission IV. Program and Practices Evaluation --
Dean E. G. Williamson, University of
Minnesota.
- Commission V. Relationships with the Field of Social
Sciences -- Dean Frank Piskor,
Syracuse University.

Friday, April 4, 1952

- 8:00 A.M. Registration -- Mezzanine Floor.
- 9:00 A.M. Fifth General Session -- Broadmoor Theater.
Presiding -- President A. Blair Knapp.
Further Discussion of the Work and Policies of the
Commissions.
Participating: The Chairmen and Members of the
Commissions. (A highly important session to
determine guiding policies for future Activities
of the Association.)
- 11:30 A.M. Convention Photograph.
- 12:30 P.M. Luncheon Session -- Main Dining Room.
Presiding -- Dean (Emeritus) Scott H. Goodnight,
University of Wisconsin (The Founder of the Associa-
tion, 1919).
General Topic, "The Foreign Student Program and Student
Exchanges."
Speakers:
Dean Robert M. Strozier, University of Chicago,
recently representing the Department of State in
the inspecting of programs in various institutions.
Dean Wesley P. Lloyd, Brigham Young University, on
leave for Special Duties as General Director of the
Counseling and Guidance Center, Kyoto, Japan.
Doctor Ben Cherrington, Director, Denver and Rocky
Mountain Regional Office, Institute of International
Education.
Discussion.
- 3:00 P.M. Sixth General Session -- Broadmoor Theater.
Presiding -- President A. Blair Knapp
Business Session: Committee Reports, Election of
Officers.
- 7:30 P.M. Annual Banquet -- Main Dining Room.
Presiding -- President A. Blair Knapp.
Toastmaster -- Dean William Tate, University of Georgia.
Invocation -- The Reverend Joseph A. Rock, S.J.,
Director of Student Personnel, Georgetown University.
Introduction of Guests.
Address -- Doctor Albert C. Jacobs, Chancellor, Univer-
sity of Denver.
Entertainment.

Saturday, April 5, 1952

- 9:00 A.M. Conference No. II. By Types of Institutions.
 Topic: "The Current Problems."
 See Chart on page xi for group assignments, places of
 group meetings, chairmen, recorders, and interrogators.
- 11:00 A.M. Seventh and Final General Session.
 Presiding -- President A. Blair Knapp.
 Final Business Session.
- 12:00 M. Adjournment.

ROSTER OF COMMITTEES

Host Committee

Dean Juan Reid, Chairman, Colorado College
 Dean Harry G. Carlson, University of Colorado
 Dean J. C. Clevenger, Colorado Agriculture and Mechanical College
 Dean Daniel D. Feder, University of Denver
 Dean Clifford Houston, University of Colorado
 Counselor M. Warner Miller, Colorado Agriculture and Mechanical
 College

Wives' Committee

Mrs. Juan Reid, Chairman, Colorado Springs
 Mrs. George W. Adams, Colorado Springs
 Mrs. H. E. Mathias, Colorado Springs

Conference Reporter - Mr. Leo Isen, Chicago, Illinois

Committee on Registration

Assistant Dean Richard E. Hulet, Chairman, University of Illinois
 Assistant Dean W. D. Blunk, University of Texas
 Assistant Dean Chaffee E. Hall, Jr., University of California
 Counselor Robert O. Murray, A. and M. College of Texas
 Dean Dave Lawrence, University of Louisville
 Assistant Dean George Lesser, University of Colorado
 Assistant Dean Robert B. Nemeschy, Ohio Wesleyan University

Committee on Reception and Hospitality

Director Glen T. Nygreen, Chairman, University of Washington
 Dean Clinton B. Gass, Nebraska Wesleyan University
 Dean A. L. Keeney, University of Wyoming
 Dean Howard V. Mathany, University of New Mexico
 Dean Guy T. McBride, The Rice Institute
 Dean Robert Moore, Arkansas State College

Committee on Reception and Hospitality (Cont'd.)

Dean Anthony C. O'Flynn, S.J., Loyola University of New Orleans
 Dean Victor T. Trusler, Kansas State Teachers College
 Dean Robert S. Waldrop, Vanderbilt University
 Dean Herbert J. Wunderlich, Montana State University

Committee on Nominations and Place

(Made up of all Past Presidents in attendance, the Senior Dean present serving as Chairman)

Dean Scott H. Goodnight, University of Wisconsin, 1919 (1), 1928 (10)
 Dean Floyd Field, Georgia Institute of Technology, 1927 (9)
 Dean H. E. Lobdell, Mass. Institute of Technology, 1934 (16)
 Dean W. E. Alderman, Miami University, 1936 (18)
 Dean Donfred H. Gardner, University of Akron, 1938(20), 1939 (21)
 President James F. Findlay, Drury College, 1940 (22)
 Vice President J. J. Thompson, St. Olaf College, 1941 (23)
 Dean Joseph A. Park, Ohio State University, 1943 (25)
 Vice President J. H. Julian, University of South Dakota, 1944 (26)
 Dean Arno Nowotny, University of Texas, 1947 (29)
 Dean E. L. Cloyd, North Carolina State College, 1948 (30)
 Dean J. H. Newman, University of Alabama, 1949 (31)
 Dean L. K. Neidlinger, Dartmouth College, 1950 (32)
 Dean Wesley P. Lloyd, Brigham Young University, 1951 (33)

Committee on Resolutions

Dean Arden O. French, Chairman, Louisiana State University
 Dean C. B. Boocock, Rutgers University
 Director Donald M. DuShane, University of Oregon
 Dean L. Dale Faunce, State University of Iowa
 Director James E. Foy, Alabama Polytechnic Institute
 Dean John E. Hocutt, College of William and Mary
 Dean Paul MacMinn, University of Oklahoma

THE COMMISSIONS

Commission No. I. Professional Relationships

Dean Victor F. Spathelf, Chairman, Wayne University
 Dean Theodore W. Biddle, University of Pittsburgh
 Assistant Dean Lester G. Brailey, University of Pittsburgh
 Dean Clarence E. Deakins, Illinois Institute of Technology
 Dean Arno J. Haack, Washington University
 Dean Russell A. Griffin, Western Reserve University
 Vice President Kenneth Little, University of Wisconsin
 Dean Erich A. Walter, University of Michigan

Commission No. II. Principles and Professional Ethics.

Dean Dean Newhouse, Chairman, Case Institute of Technology
 Dean Melvin A. Anderson, Hiram College
 Dean Donfred H. Gardner, University of Akron
 Dean Francis R. B. Godolphin, Princeton University
 Dean William S. Guthrie, Ohio State University
 Dean Maurel Hunkins, Ohio University
 Dean Donald S. Parks, University of Toledo
 Dean J. N. Stauffer, Wittenberg College
 Dean William Tate, University of Georgia
 Dean H. Donald Winbigler, Stanford University

Commission No. III. Development and Training of Student Personnel Administrators.

Assistant Dean J. Leslie Rollins, Chairman, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration.
 The members of this commission have not been appointed. Dean Rollins has appointed an ad hoc committee to join him in studying the question, the members of this committee being:
 Director Vernon R. Alden, Harvard Graduate School of Business Admin.
 Assistant to the Dean Thomas A. Graves, Jr., Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration
 President Paul M. Pitman, College of Idaho
 Mr. Curtis W. Tarr, Harvard Graduate School of Business Admin.
 Doctor Simon Williams, Lecturer in the General College, Boston University.

Commission No. IV. Program and Practices Evaluation.

Dean E. G. Williamson, Chairman, University of Minnesota
 Dean Merrill E. Jarchow, Carleton College
 Vice President J. H. Julian, University of South Dakota
 Dean Robert Kamm, Drake University
 Doctor Gordon Klopff, University of Wisconsin

Commission No. V. Relationships with the Field of Social Sciences.

Dean Frank Piskor, Chairman, Syracuse University
 Dean Frank C. Baldwin, Cornell University
 Assistant Dean Clifford J. Craven, Syracuse University
 Doctor Lowell H. Hattery, American University
 Dean W. Storrs Lee, Middlebury College
 Doctor Roy A. Price, Syracuse University

CONFERENCE NO. I

TOPIC: How Can We Effectively Develop a Sense of Higher Standards of Personal Integrity and Individual Responsibility in the University and College Community.

Time: 3:00 P.M., Thursday, April 3, 1952

Group	Meeting Room	Leaders
GROUP I		Chairman: Dean Robert K. Knapp University of South Dakota
Institutions with up to 1,500 students		Recorder: Dean Frank W. Clippinger Drury College
		Interrogators: Dean R. S. Griffin University of Nevada
		Dean Henry M. Helgen, Jr. Augustana College
		Dean George H. Ryden Oklahoma City University
	North Lake Room	Dean Waldo Shumway Stevens Institute of Technology
		Dean Robert E. Thorn Grove City College
GROUP II		Chairman: Dean L. Gray Burdin Butler University
Institutions with 1,500 to 4,000 students		Recorder: Dean Dudley G. Fulton Northwestern State College
		Interrogators: Dean Arch B. Conklin Bowling Green State University
		Dean I. Clark Davis Southern Illinois University
		Dean J. B. Jackson University of South Carolina
	Broadmoor Theater	Dean Donald J. Robertson University of North Dakota
		Dean John Earl Shoemaker University of Arkansas
GROUP III		Chairman: Dean W. L. Penberthy A. and M. College of Texas
Institutions with 4,000 to 7,000 students		Recorder: Dean Robert W. Bishop University of Cincinnati
		Interrogators: Dean J. Thomas Askew University of Georgia
		Dean R. E. Manchester Kent State University
	Main Ballroom	Dean Jack Matthews, Univ. of Missouri
		Dean A. Louis Slonaker, Univ. of Ariz.
		Dean T. J. Thompson, Univ. of Nebr.

CONFERENCE NO. I (Cont'd.)

GROUP IV	Chairman:	Dean Bernard L. Hyink University of Southern California
Institutions with over 7,000 students	Recorder:	Dean Frank C. Baldwin Cornell University
	Interrogators:	Director Geary Eppley University of Maryland Dean Jack Holland, Univ. of Texas Director Donald R. Mallett Purdue University Dean R. R. Oglesby Oklahoma A. and M. College Counselor Lyle A. Thorburn Michigan State College
Green Room		

CONFERENCE NO. II

TOPIC: The Current Problems

Time: 9:00 A.M., Saturday, April 5, 1952

GROUP I	Chairman:	Dean R. C. Beaty University of Florida
Publicly supported institu- tions	Recorder:	Dean John F. Quinn University of Rhode Island
	Interrogators:	Dean John L. Ballif University of Utah Dean R. G. Lowrey Mississippi Southern College Dean Darold L. Shutt Marshall College Assistant Dean Harold E. Stewart Wayne University Dean John E. Stewart University of Maine
Broadmoor Theater		

CONFERENCE NO. II (Cont'd.)

GROUP II	Chairman:	Dean John H. Stibbs Tulane University
Privately supported institutions	Recorder:	Dean Frank R. Hunt Lafayette College
	Interrogators:	Dean Eugene T. Haskins Culver-Stockton College Dean Harold W. Melvin Northeastern University Dean J. J. Somerville Ohio Wesleyan University Dean Lee Bowen Spencer Oklahoma Baptist University Dean E. Douglas Webster Utica College of Syracuse Univ.
Main Ballroom		

GROUP III	Chairman:	Associate Dean Paul C. Eaton California Institute of Technology
Technical and engineer- ing in- stitutions	Recorder:	Dean James G. Allen Texas Technological College
	Interrogators:	Dean James A. Dickinson Carnegie Institute of Technology Dean W. J. Farrisee Clarkson College of Technology Asst. Dean Robert E. Cunningham Illinois Institute of Technology Associate Dean J. J. Pershing Georgia Institute of Technology Dean Richard A. Waite, Jr. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Green Room		

GROUP IV	Chairman:	Dean J. W. Rollins East Texas State Teachers College
Teacher training institu- tions	Recorder:	Dean Ray C. Pellett Western Michigan College of Educ.
	Interrogators:	Dean R. H. Linkins Illinois State Normal University Dean W. E. Marshall East Carolina State Teachers Col. Dean O. T. Richardson Ball State Teachers College Dean Louis G. Schmidt Eastern Illinois State College Director S. R. Toussaint Colorado State College of Education
North Lake Room		

WEDNESDAY EVENING SESSION

April 2, 1952

The Opening Session of the Thirty-Fourth Anniversary Conference of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, held April 2-5, 1952, at the Broadmoor Hotel, Colorado Springs, Colorado, convened at seven forty-five o'clock, President A. Blair Knapp, Denison University, presiding.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: After this next introduction, it will be my pleasure to declare this Convention in session. I should like to present Dean Bosworth, who will lead us in prayer.

DEAN E. F. BOSWORTH (Dean of Men, Oberlin College): In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And God said, Let there be light; and there was light. And God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him. And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good.

O God, our Heavenly Father, creator and sustainer of all life and light, in whose mind there is a great plan for the universe, a plan in which there is a part for each of us to play, fill us with the sense of Thy nearness and of Thy care for us. Deliver us from cynicism and indifference. May our enthusiasm and insight steadily develop with increasing warmth and clearness. May we more and more be worthy sons, created in Thy image, and sharing in Thy great plan.

We need Thee, our Father, and we humbly ask for Thy guiding presence during the hours and days we spend together here. Amen.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: It had been my intention, following the invocation, to say, "Gentlemen and your better halves, the Conference is in session." In view of certain action taken a year ago, I do not know whether that is entirely appropriate or not, because I have not checked with the registration desk. I see that my little pun didn't get across exactly. [Laughter] The point is, I am not too sure whether our ladies out there are wives or members of this Conference. [Laughter]

It is my very real pleasure now to introduce our host, Dean Juan Reid, who has some announcements for us.

DEAN JUAN REID (Dean of Men, Colorado College): The first announcement I would like to make has some reference to some very derogatory remarks made towards me and our community here in Colorado Springs, that were made last year at the Chase Hotel.

I want to announce now that I personally am entirely responsible for the weather we are having here, [laughter] and if there is any change for the worse, it will be entirely due to some disturbing influence that moved up from Texas. [Laughter]

... Announcements ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Thank you, Juan, and we do like the weather.

We regret very much that President Gill of our host college, because of illness, is unable to be with us, but it is my very real pleasure to present Dean Adams, Dean of Colorado College, who will speak to us on President Gill's behalf.

DEAN GEORGE J. ADAMS (Dean of the College, Colorado College): Thank you, President Knapp. Following the hint from your President, I should perhaps then address this assembly as Gentlemen and Ex-Officio Gentlemen. [Laughter]

I have noticed with interest after looking over the program that a great many of you have the title of Dean in front of your names. When I first became an Assistant Dean long ago, and far away, people to whom I was introduced always made a point of giggling and producing one of various Dean's stories. One that they particularly liked to give me, because I had an "assistant" in front of my title, was the definition of an assistant dean as a mouse with aspirations toward growing into a rat. [Laughter]

I can say that as part of a welcome speech because, as we all know, one of the great troubles with the title of "Dean" is that it covers so many different things, so many different kinds of people doing so many different kinds of things. That story was told about my kind of Dean, an academic dean: The academic dean who lures the men to the faculty with false promises, who declines to give them raises when due, and finally manages to see that he is thrown out to starve. [Laughter] So my kind of dean has earned the bad name that you sometimes suffer for. But I notice that you have tried to take your organization away from that stigma by changing the title of it.

We at Colorado College are proud of our little college. We are proud of the usual things that people are proud of in colleges. We are proud of the faculty; we are proud of the students; we are proud of the library. We are particularly proud of our hockey team and our President.

I think it is a very real loss to you that General Gill was unable to be present. He is a former soldier who has "made

good" most successfully here, and who is a man of considerable charm as well as force of character.

I hope in the course of your visit here you will have time to come out and visit the College. It is reached very easily by getting on the State Highway and simply following your face north until you come to a large sign that says "Colorado College."

I think that when you visit the College you might also like to visit our affiliate, the Colorado Springs Fine Arts Center, which is a most unusual place, and which is right now having a most unusual showing of a collection of Old Masters which was sent out here from New York to save it from the atom bomb, and which was not exhibited any place ever. It belonged to a rich collector.

In giving you this welcome talk, I overlooked one item of great pride. We are also proud of our Dean of Men, Juan Reid. Juan is the deep and earnest friend of each and every one of you, and the high point of his life each year is when he goes away to meet you. He came home last year just bubbling over with joy at the thought that he was to be your host and try to make you happy here. And if you go away from here with even the slightest feeling that you have not been "done right by", and Juan finds that out, he is going to be extremely unhappy.

So, as a favor to him, if there is anything at all -- that is manageable -- that you would like to see corrected, please tell Juan and make him happy, and keep him from shedding those bitter tears. [Laughter]

I thank you. [Applause]

PRESIDENT KNAPP: We have been so pleasantly entertained in so many places over the years that we have developed a little custom of having one of our more esteemed brethren respond to notes of welcome of this sort. So, Sir, I am saying to you, thank you and we have a real privilege tonight in having a gentleman from Texas respond to your greeting -- Arno Nowotny.

... Cries of "Stand up" [Laughter] ...

DEAN ARNO NOWOTNY (Dean of Student Life, University of Texas): I'm doing the best I can, brother. [Laughter]

Mr. President, Dean Adams, Texans, Ladies and Gentlemen: They say at the University that I am a man of a few words, but that I like to use them very often. [Laughter]

In responding to this address of welcome, Dean Adams, I am reminded of the British election recently when, in a theater of this kind, Mr. Churchill was addressing a crowd. It was packed to the gills. One old boy in the front row kept standing up and yelling, "What did Gladstone say in 1706?"

About the third time, he got Churchill's goat, and Churchill had an officer escort him out. When the Bobby got him safely out, his curiosity got the better of him and he asked, "What did Gladstone say in 1706?"

The old man said, "I don't know. I just wanted to get out of that mob." [Laughter]

There are a lot of reasons we are glad to be here.

Incidentally, a Texan went to England not long ago. He got lost and asked a policeman, "Where am I at?" The policeman said, "You should not say that. You should say, 'Where is my hat?'" [Laughter]

There are a lot of reasons why we are happy to be in Colorado Springs. It is a good thing to get away once in a while from our local mob and come away and do our own job analysis and our own job classification and job evaluation. If we get away and look at it maybe we can get a new idea, and with an exchange of ideas refresh ourselves for going back to do a better job.

You already hinted at the second reason why we are glad to be here. Brother, if you boys ever decide you don't want this Juan Reid, I know lots of us can really use him. None of the boys in this Association are more liked than Juan Reid. I know he is afraid of these Texans, but I have arranged to meet Mrs. Reid soon. [Laughter]

The third and last reason is this: In 1928, at the Tenth Anniversary of our Association, we came to Colorado to follow that admonition of the great Greeley to "Go West!" You will find in the minutes of that Convention a lot of great names who participated rather actively: M. S. Culver of Kentucky, Tommy Arkle Clark of Illinois, Scott Goodnight of Wisconsin, Stanley Coulter of Purdue, Vic Moore of the University of Texas, Joe Bursley of Michigan; and there were three young upstarts there, a young Princetonian, a guy named Don Gardner, Les Rollins of Northwestern, and Fred Turner from Illinois.

The feature address was given by old Francis Shepardson who addressed a joint meeting of the Inter-Fraternity Council and

our Association. We had a big time; yet I think it is too long to wait twenty-four years to come back to what to me is one of the most beautiful spots, not only in America but in the world.

I think that it does something to get a man up a little higher above the ordinary level of the plains and broaden his horizon and get a little altitude where he gets a little of the dust out of his eyes and forgets some of his prejudices, and gets a little more visibility and a little more vision.

I don't want to talk like an old Texas boy who went to church one day and he was the only one present. The priest came over to him and said, "Well, what do you suggest I do?"

He said, "I'm just an old cowhand, and I don't really know much, but if I went out to feed my stock and only one cow showed up, I'd go right ahead and feed her.

The preacher said, "All right," and he went ahead and preached an hour and fifteen minutes sermon, and finally he said, "Well, what do you think?"

He said, "I'm an old cowhand, and I don't know much, but if I went out to feed my stock, and only one cow showed up, I wouldn't dump the whole load." [Laughter]

Dean Adams, we are happy to be here. [Laughter and applause]

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Thank you, "Shorty."

As you probably noticed by the program, the somewhat traditional order has been changed a little bit this year. Normally at the opening session the President of this Association has an opportunity to say whatever is on his mind, and I am going to do that tomorrow noon. I think at that time I think I am going to tell you a little about how this program managed to get put together. It didn't just happen; there has been some thinking behind it, some conviction behind it.

Tonight our next speaker very definitely is contributing to the program that we shall pursue tomorrow. He is kind of giving us the kick-off, I think, because there were many of us who felt that the general topic to which we now address ourselves was perhaps the most vital thing that could be before us.

I should like to say that the specific suggestion -- the first one at least -- in this direction came from our dear friend

Garner Hubbell, who will not be with us this year, and it was one of those letters that those of you who have heard from Garner Hubbell know were straight from the heart. I hope that we can report to him that his suggestion has been fulfilled.

With that very brief introduction, I should like to present you, Sir, to an audience of committed people. They are people who are committed to a concept of service to young people that has endured for a long time. Your assigned topic, which you have graciously accepted, "How Can We Effectively Develop a Sense of Higher Standards of Personal Integrity and Individual Responsibility in the University and College Community," is one I think will challenge the best in all of us.

I give you Dr. Glenn A. Olds, Chaplain of the University of Denver. [Applause]

DR. GLENN A. OLDS (Chaplain, University of Denver):
Every time I take my watch out I am reminded of that story that is told of a couple of playmates. One was a Catholic boy and the other a Protestant.

The Protestant boy visited the Catholic boy's church, which was a bit complicated to him at first, so the little Catholic playmate began to describe each of the functions and the role of the Priest. The next Sunday they visited the little Protestant boy's church, and the first thing the preacher did was to take out his watch and lay it on the pulpit. The little Catholic boy turned to his playmate and said, "Tell me, what does that mean?" To which the little Protestant boy replied, "Not a damn thing." [Laughter]

With a topic like you have given me, I assume it will take some time and I hope to call upon your charity in the process of its development. Before I begin, I do want to observe what always comes to my mind when I come to a Conference like this, into which so much work and planning has gone. I am mindful of a fraternity brother of mine who became a preacher and when he went to his first charge he developed a curious habit. After he finished his morning service he would be seen disappearing out to the edge of the meadow in the little Iowa town, and go into the woods and be gone for a couple of hours.

Nobody really knew what he was doing or where he had gone. The people in the local parish became so concerned about it, but no one had enough nerve to follow him to see what he did in the woods, so they called in the district superintendent, being a Methodist, and asked him to call the fellow in, which he did. He said, "Look, John, this is complicating your ministry.

The people are getting curious. What do you do in those woods anyway?

John said, "I'd really rather not say." So as it is the policy in a Methodist church, they went a little higher. They went to the Bishop and said, "This is becoming so distressing to the local parishoners, we may have to get rid of this fellow."

So the Bishop called him in and said, "John, what do you do after the Sunday services, disappearing for a couple of hours?" He said, "Bishop, I'd really rather not say." The Bishop said, "John, I asked what do you do?" So he decided to tell him and he said, "After I work hard all week in the parish, when the Sunday service is over, I just go out to the edge of town and disappear into the woods. About a mile and a quarter in there is a big cut in the bank, and I sit down there on the edge of the bank and wait there by the side of the railroad tracks that cut through the ravine. Sometimes I wait an hour; sometimes a half hour; sometimes longer. Presently I hear a whistle around the bend, and the streamliner to the West Coast goes whistling by, and, Bishop, you don't know what it does to me to see something go I don't have to push." [Laughter]

When I received the invitation to be with you, and re-read the topic with care, I was mindful of the tremendous scope of the question. I felt very much like that medical school student who, when he graduated, had been unfortunate enough not to have specialized. So when he went to the first clinical interview to be taken on the staff and they asked him what he had specialized in, he fumbled around a little bit and said, "I guess I really specialize in the skin and its contents." [Laughter]

In a sense the scope of the question posed, with which I begin now, is almost as broad and as deep as the consideration of any philosophy of student work and student personnel. Yet I am pretentious enough to try to pull it into some kind of focus.

I hope it will be permissible, Dean Turner and President Knapp, to re-state the question, somewhat more pointedly, for me at least, for I take it that the problem of personal integrity and responsibility bring the person into prominence, so I would like to re-state the problem tonight. This is not an evasion, but an attempt at focus, which I would like to call "Remaking the Higher Learner in Higher Learning." This is the focus and the theme with which I want to begin.

I would like to borrow a medical metaphor by way of outline and analysis. Every doctor goes through three stages in

his handling of patients: 1. Diagnosis. 2. Prognosis.
3. Prescription.

Now, every talk ought to have three points, they used to tell us in Seminary. Those are my three points. I want to deal first with diagnosis, an attempt at analysis, and in that I shall deal with man's predicament, man's past and man's power. Then I shall move to the prognosis, in the light of this analysis, concerning what the future may hold for us in this kind of service, and deal with man's perversions and possibilities.

Finally, with respect to prescription, I shall try to deal with his prospects.

I have a jaded memory and I have tried to use alliteration for the sake of outlining my remarks. Shall I run them about again?

I shall deal with man's predicament, man's past, and man's powers, then his perversions and possibilities; and finally his prospects. That is to say, I want to get under, if I can, the thesis which you have given me.

Let's begin then, with man's predicament.

George Bernard Shaw, thirty years ago, said that civilization may be destroyed in education's race with disaster. That was in the prophetic days following the first World War of a kind of sentimental idealism and optimism about the role of education in the transformation of human life and culture. It was Shaw's conviction that education was the primary instrument of the transforming of men into that kind of character and community which would be a foreboding of peace.

That was thirty years ago, and I submit that the events which have transpired since that time have served to sharply qualify the wistful wisdom of George Bernard Shaw. That is to say, we have now come to discover that education may not be an ally of civilization in the race with disaster, but may be the instrument actually of the disaster itself, for it is a fact of history that the two most literate nations of the world, in the last ten years who had achieved not only the highest measure of literacy -- some 97 per cent literate -- had also brought to flower the final perfecting of that technological culture which we have come to identify as a liberal outlook in the west, namely Germany, and Japan.

Thoughtful students of history would presume that it is no longer self-evident that education, per se, may save us from

our race with disaster. Indeed, it points to the fact that the University community which we once presumed to be the center of sanity in a mad world, is no longer a center of sanity, but a mirror of the world's confusion, for indeed in the University community itself there are the same seeds of dissension, of violence, of conflict and anxiety that characterizes our particular period of history.

If one were to characterize our contemporary campus, I think he could do it in terms of the breakdown in learning the elementary A-B-C's of life. Let me illustrate that if I may.

One could describe the contemporary campus as one of ambiguous acts, bewildering beliefs, and confused commitments, the A-B-C's of life -- acts, belief and commitment.

The University community has become a place of ambiguous acts. Here we profess theoretical skepticism regarding the possible knowledge of right and wrong, and yet continue to act with devastating singleness regarding our particular version of what is right and wrong. It is a place of bewildering beliefs. Here, for instance, we have come to believe that it is basically rational to hold that there is no basic rational universe. We have come to believe that the ultimate meaning of life is that there is no ultimate meaning. It is a place of confused commitments.

Here is the ironic state of mind where we are ultimately committed to no commitment. Let me put it another way. We have come to the point that we are passionately committed to neutrality. This curious ambiguity in our perspective is that we are ultimately committed to a position which is non-committal with respect to the issues of life.

The predicament of the modern campus, which is the context for our analysis of the problem of personal integrity and responsibility is that it is a center of contrast, of conflict, and of ambiguity. My suggestion is that the predicament of the campus is the predicament of man; that man himself is essentially a being of conflict, a being of ambiguity. He is a curious mixture of the real and the ideal. He is a curious blend of actuality and possibility. He is, as it were, a person caught in the tension, between nature and that reality of meaning which transcends nature and constrains it. He is a child of nature, but an unruly child, capable of transcending it and mastering it. And this predicament of man's is the fundamental clue to the nature of our problem.

It could be symbolized, I think, in many ways, but nowhere more pointedly -- I got fouled out on this. Where am I at? [Laughter] I know I shouldn't use a proposition to end a sentence with, [Laughter] but it is part of my dilemma [Laughter], my predicament. This predicament could be symbolized I think in the leap to death of James Forrestal.

I wonder if you pondered, when you read that for the first time, on the somewhat dramatic way in which Forrestal's leap to death symbolizes really the predicament of modern man. Did you think of it for a moment? Here's a man who gives his life to preserve freedom against the threat from outside, to finally be besieged and taken by the threat from within. Here's a man who gives his life to bringing to a halt the taking of one's neighbor's life, to end by taking his own. Here is a man who extols self-discipline, self-reliance, but who ends by finding himself unreliable in the face of the issues of life.

I do not presume to psychoanalyze suicide -- I will leave the psychoanalysis for tomorrow.

Incidentally, as a footnote, in thinking of Brother Juan's happiness, have you heard the latest definition of a psychologist? He is one who helps people be unhappy more intelligently. [Laughter]

Or perhaps even a better one that I ran across the other day: A psychologist is one who pulls habits out of rabbits. [Laughter]

Coming back to Forrestal as a symbol of our dilemma and predicament: In our zealous concern to preserve personal integrity and responsibility, we actually end by destroying it because man, to be himself, must always be more than himself, and yet he loves himself so much that he tries to be himself by being only himself and thereby destroys himself.

That is not a conundrum; it was an attempt to state a thesis that man, being what he is, can only be himself by being more than himself, and yet he loves himself so much that he tries to be himself by being only himself, and he ends by destroying himself. The reasons for this are many and legion, I think.

A look at man's past provides important clues to the way in which this predicament has ruptured and broken our personal integrity and responsibility on university campuses and everywhere else. I look now, for a moment at least, at man's past.

Man's past reflects at least three masters in whose tutelage he has been brought up, whose parentage has disciplined his spirit and qualified his outlook. I mention three--there are probably more--but three important masters which speak for man's past a word of challenge with the emphasis on personal integrity and responsibility.

First, the animal. Thomas Huxley said, "The animal was here about five hundred million years before man," and this is thought to be a conservative British estimate. This is the recognition that the organic base of human life, the physiological structure which is the base of operation for most students and for most men has a long parentage in animal ancestry, and this must be understood if we are to help men. It is obvious, I think, that the mark of the animal can be described as unrestrained, undisciplined and arbitrary appetite or desire.

Of course one recognizes this has been pretty largely sublimated on college campuses, shall I say channeled into appropriate calendar days. Normally we can successfully hold this through the week, but we see it showing its head in the local shrine, the stadium, on Saturday afternoons, on Saturday nights and frequently even on Sundays.

The way in which these undisciplined appetites, which are arbitrary and unchallenged by principle, tend to infect even the college campus in a way that we must understand if we are to try to help foster personal integrity and personal responsibility. The key to integrity is consistency. A footnote now to acknowledge Emerson, who described consistency as "the hobgoblin of little minds," but nevertheless consistency is the root of integrity. It consumes it, and the animal ancestry is a permanent antagonist of principle and consistency.

There is a second parent. I had better get in overdrive here; with six points and several points under each point, I had better get on.

Have a look for a moment at the second master in man's past -- the savage. The savage mind is characterized by primitive taboo and the complete dominance of the group mind. The savage inheritance, which animates our past, shows its head in the curious restraint, if not violent restraint, of independent judgment, of atypical behavior, of responses of the self which are not sanctioned by the group. The paralysis of the group mind is everywhere apparent on at least those campuses where I have had the privilege to serve.

This curious way of achieving conformity at all levels and of in a subtle way stifling independent judgment, which is the root of integrity and the ground of responsibility -- the group mind may operate in terms of primitive fears, animated by historical tension in the social scene; it may be animated by arbitrary administration and insecurities that are a consequence of it; but whatever is the cause, it certainly seems to me obvious that it operates with respect to students in a curious stifling of the independent judgment and responsible action which are the roots of integrity.

The third master in the house in which most men live, and surely students before their final maturity, is the child. Now, the child is one that ought to be kept alive, I concede, in all of us. Who was the poet who said, "A child's face looking up, holding wonder as a cup." The element of wonder, innocence, surely is one of the essentials to education. But there is another mark which is the final enemy of personal integrity and responsibility. This is the egocentric perspective of all children. The child's world is a world which he presumes revolves around himself, which focuses inward, and tends to encourage him in the belief that he is actually the center of things.

I submit that this mood is abroad on our campuses and in some areas is symbolized by the work of student personnel. (I knew I would get personal here, somewhere along the line.) That is to say, there is a mood in some institutions which would tend to insulate the student against the normal traffic of human life. The university community is already one degree abstracted from the normal flux of human life--certain immunities, certain principles of selectivity operate here. But there is also a mood abroad which would presume to focus entirely in the educational process upon the student.

Now that is ambiguous. In a sense that ought to be the center of education; in another sense students are not helped to achieve personal integrity and final maturity in terms of responsibility when the perspective of egocentricism is encouraged and maintained.

All three of these -- the animal, the savage, and the child -- are echos out of the past which tend to contribute to our present predicament --the difficulty in achieving personal integrity and responsibility. But not all of his predicament is a product of the past. It is a product also of his present powers.

Man's power -- and this is my third point -- has been analyzed by thoughtful students of nature in our time, in essentially two ways that has influenced broadly the campus. I speak of

those by way of suggestion. I will call them the optimistic view of man's power and the pessimistic view. That is about as oversimplified as one could get, I guess.

The optimistic view of man's power is the notion that man is fundamentally rational, and fundamentally good, and that one can count on his personal integrity and responsibility.

Let me illustrate the outlook of this perspective in four areas. In education, this is the concept of man which has parented so-called progressive education, with many variations; the notion that since man is basically rational and good -- and this is the secret of his power -- the role of education is to permit this power to come to full fruition, and to try to exercise as little restraint as possible, as little authority as possible in the unfolding of this natural disposition of the human spirit.

In the realm of economics, this is even more graphic in the French phrase *laissez faire*. This is the notion that since men are basically rational and good we ought to let alone, to keep hands off their economic activity and permit the full flowering of this potential.

In the realm of politics you recognize this as associated with the man in the black derby and an umbrella. This is the notion that since man is basically rational and good nations composed of reasonable men ought to be permitted to fulfill their own historic destiny without interference or restraint from outside.

In the realm of religion, in passing, this is the notion that since man is basically rational and good, religion consists primarily in removing his ignorance and alleviating social injustices.

This is the concept of the optimistic view of man and his power. I think the events of recent history are perhaps largely responsible for the challenge of this view, and the other interpretation of man which has come into prominence on our university campuses, the notion that man is basically irrational, a creature of impulse and desire, who is not to be trusted, who is perverse and egocentric in all his ways.

In the realm of education this has parented a new conception of the role of propaganda as against persuasion; the role of authority as against the role of elective choice.

In the realm of economics you recognize it as planned economy, the attempt to restrain men in their selfish impulses,

in the interest of social welfare. In religion it is the revival of the notion that man is "- what is the term that Carl Bard uses-- "a contemporary theologian". The best thing you can say about a man, the way he puts it, is that he is not a cat. [Laughter] This is not very much to be said about man's potential power.

My suggestion for what it is, for your deliberation, is that both of these views which dominate the contemporary education in this country are essentially wrong. The optimistic one is broad but not deep. The pessimistic one is deep but not broad. Neither of them have the dimension of height essential to man's nature.

I borrow from the Christian faith in which tradition our education in this country was conceived, at least the corrective to the understanding of man's power. Man's power, this point of view would suggest, lies not essentially in his rationality or irrationality, in his impulse or desire, but lies rather in his capacity for spiritual self-transcendence; or, to put it simply, lies essentially in the fact that he lives essentially in the act of transcending himself.

This fact about man is his essential freedom, his essential nature, this capacity for self-transcendence is the ground of his personal integrity and the root of his moral responsibility. Indeed, this conception of man's power suggests that the primary concern of all education is the spiritual orientation which defines the basic perspective within which reason operates and within which desires are cultivated and transformed. Fail to attend to this, suggests this perspective, and all man's education may be perverted and exploited in the very destruction of the freedom which it initiates.

This power of man, therefore, becomes the primitive clue to the nature of personal integrity and personal responsibility and suggests why it is that the problem is so inward and difficult to lay hold upon and something of the perspective for its resolution. The power of man, lying in the capacity to go beyond himself, to rise higher than himself and other than himself, becoming the principle clue, suggests for us the necessity to examine the right use and the wrong use of this freedom which is man's essential power.

I speak first of its wrong use because I think this is a bit more evident. I turn now to the fourth point I wanted to make, which concerns the perversion of man's personal integrity and responsibility.

The perversion of this power of man, his essential nature that is, can be described at three levels and I shall use alliteration to help fix it in our mind. The first level is the disuse of his freedom. The second level is the misuse of his freedom. And the third level is the abuse of his freedom.

Let me try to particularize those levels in terms of campus colloquialism. The first level of the perversion I described as the disuse of one's freedom. This is the refusal to be a responsible person. That is to say, the refusal to transcend one's self in the interests of anything which lies higher, or other than oneself. This is the sickening subjectivity which shuts out the possibility of responsibility. This is what Fichte called "the sin of inertia", what Toynbee in his "Analysis" called "resting on one's oars," or what one would describe on any campus as "apathetic insensitivity;" the inability or apparent refusal to be free, in the sense of rising above oneself, out of regard for anything higher and anything other than oneself.

Let me draw this rather close to home by way of illustration. On our campus at the University of Denver -- a campus of some 9,000 students -- the United Fund drive was just completed on the part of canvassing the student body and faculty out of regard for student needs abroad, an attempt to try to raise a fund to keep some students alive in Asia and in Europe. And do you know what we raised on our campus? I am embarrassed to mention it, but slightly over \$3500 -- about 35-cents apiece, the price of a hamburger and a cup of coffee.

This was the mark of that dimension of concern which takes one out of himself in regard for anyone other than himself, which is the root of moral responsibility; the curious paralysis of imagination and of sympathy which enables it to be possible to be completely indifferent or almost so to the tragic dimensions of the historical crisis of students like themselves in other parts of the world.

This could be duplicated I am sure on many campuses: The mark of the disuse of one's freedom; the refusal to be responsible.

The second level of this perversion I called the misuse of one's freedom. The right use of one's freedom suggests the real transcendence of the self, the real going beyond the self in the interests of what lies higher and other than oneself. Yet men may misuse this freedom and rise above themselves for the purpose of viewing themselves from this vantage point, and thereby worshipping themselves.

You know the tendency, don't you? Here is a college professor who in the process of his lecturing on English literature transcends himself in the very act of lecturing and says to himself, "Boy, I really got them eating out of my hand." He doesn't say that to them, but this is the fleeting mood that passes through his mind.

Or here is a college couple -- this happens in Denver, I'm told -- out on a Saturday night in a parked car overlooking the city. He slips his arm around her and in the language of the campus, which is more apt than it knows, he makes love. That is what he does. He makes it; it is artificial, you see. In the very act of making love he transcends the love making and views himself as the lover and says, "Boy, am I wooing her!" [Laughter] This is perverse in the sense that it misuses his capacity for spiritual self-transcendence. What actually happens is that he uses the beloved as an instrument of his own self-worship.

This is true also of the teacher who uses his students as the occasion for his magnificent lecturing. In either case what happens is the personal integrity -- it was Socrates at the end of Plato's "Dialogue" who prays to the gods, "O God of Pan and all the other Gods who dwell therein, make the outer and the inner man fast friends." This is the meaning of integrity. But what happens in the misuse of one's freedom is his action presumes to deceive the person into thinking he has a regard for him which is not genuine. Actually in the process he fractures his own integrity and vitiates his own responsibility for the other.

The third level of perversion, which is happily not so apparent on most campuses I think, is what I have called the abuse of this power of self-transcendence. The abuse lies in the fact that men transcend themselves, rise above themselves, not for the sake of viewing themselves as an object but for the sake of maintaining this transcendent position. That is to say, in their presumption, to play God. This is that megalomania which some psychologists think animated the life of Benito Mussolini and Adolf Hitler.

This is the kind of perversion which animates those power-mad administrators -- there may be some around, I don't know -- which jealously guards their position of power and sets them in conflict with anyone who would tend to threaten their position of transcendence.

This is one of the tragic dilemmas which fractures personal integrity and responsibility on college campuses at the faculty and student level, the curious jockeying for this transcendent position of power and the kind of nascent hostility and violence which is set up whenever this position is threatened.

Now to have a look at the possibilities of men, through the right use of this power. I have moved now to the fifth point, the right use of man's possibilities. The possibilities that are opened by an understanding of man's power as the capacity for self-transcendence are literally unlimited -- by anything other than his own nature, to be sure. The possibility of man is given in the very fact of self-transcendence; the clue is that man is by nature a person who can only be himself by transcending himself.

I move on a central symbol to Christians at least at this period of the year, to suggest in a helpful and graphic way I hope the right use of this freedom. I mention the sign of the cross.

The sign of the cross, in its upright, vertical dimension points to man's possibility in terms of the vertical reach -- that is to say, it points God-ward, higher, and the horizontal cross-bar is the axis which points to the other in terms of which the full power of men can be realized: Higher minded, other minded, and these belong together.

Whenever a man serves something higher than himself, which does not at the same time contribute to his service of his neighbor he is not realizing himself, but sets himself in conflict with his neighbor. When a man serves his neighbor simply without any higher coordinate there is no security against his turning his service of the other into the occasion for domination and control. The higher-minded, other-minded reach of man suggests the roots of his integrity and his responsibility.

The roots of his integrity lie in the commitment to that which is higher than himself and in terms of which the fidelity of all his acts must be brought to bear. The obligation to his neighbor in his need becomes the axis of moral responsibility where he translates the principles and personal integrity into the acts of a consistent life of service.

These clues provided by the sign of the cross suggest, I think, in a faltering fashion to be sure, something of the perspective that we must envisage if we are to move in the direction of developing a sense of personal responsibility and also a sense of moral responsibility.

This all, of course, brings us now to the final point, which is the most difficult as always, and from which preachers are always walking out from under at twelve o'clock.

I will try to stay with it for a few minutes and examine with you, by way of prescription, something of the possibility

and prospect for us of a plan of action. If what I have said is true, or anywhere near the truth concerning man's predicament and past, and powers and perversions and possibilities, then it follows, it seems to me, that any plan of action for us, in the interests of deepening this sense of personal integrity and responsibility on college campuses requires several things.

First of all, it requires that we reconstruct the campus creed in terms of its understanding of education and its understanding of man. Let me particularize that just a bit.

In terms of the reconstruction of the campus credo regarding education, we must effect as rapidly as possible a shift from a concern for mastering objects to a concern for perfecting persons.

General Arnold, you will remember, of the Air Corps, described our culture as one which produced a technological giant and moral midgets in mastering objects and the pathetic failure we had in transforming human subjects.

Secondly, we must some way effect the transition from the mastery of techniques to the mastery of character.

Third, we must move somewhat from the emphasis upon credits to a new-found emphasis upon character.

These I know remain at this level, but I assume that the suggestions that I was to make tonight would become something of a context, I would hope, a stimulation to your own concrete deliberation in terms of practical action.

Our philosophy of education must be radically re-shaped if we are to effect this kind of converted emphasis. Second, our philosophy of man must be reconstructed if we are to do justice to his predicament.

This philosophy of man I would describe broadly as the thesis that man is essentially an animal, that man is essentially a consequence and not a cause in the historical process -- that is to say, psychological or sociological determinism -- and that man's freedom is to be construed primarily in terms of obedience to principles which constrain him but which are not, from his point of view, self-determining.

This pervasive philosophy which is variously described and characterized is a final threat to the emphasis upon man's power for self-determination, which is at the root of personal integrity and personal responsibility.

Whenever we try to encourage them in the phase of a philosophy which denies them, we are contributing to the schizophrenia of our students and not to their psychological health, and this dilemma is heavy upon us.

We must do more than reconstruct the credo. I think we must secondly reconstruct our commitments. That is to say, we must reconstruct our commitments away from the idols of the campus (of power, possessions, prestige and privilege) to a commitment to persons in their several human needs and their perfection.

This shift takes us out of the mood of that scientific ideal of neutrality and objectivity into a realm of commitment and (if you will permit me to use the word loosely) subjectivity, if I mean by that the realm of intention of choice and of ultimate loyalties.

Finally, we must reconstruct our campus communities, in fact, to correspond with a reconstructed credo and commitment. This reconstruction of the college campus begins where we are and proceeds from that level in terms of concern, conscientiousness and compassion for the students who are our charge and our tutors, and in whose fellowship we may hope to find some of the clues at least to personal integrity and responsibility.

I end with a story. It is a story that came out of my home state, Oregon, in the last war

On the rugged Oregon coast, as most of you know, there are conveniently placed from point to point along the coast lighthouses for the protection of the fishing, tuna schooners. These lighthouses are terribly important in the spring when the waves are high and nasty.

During the last war most of the crews of the lighthouses were taken into the Navy or Coast Guard, and so they were left to be manned by greyhaired, retired men and green crews of boys under seventeen. This day at Tillamook beachhead a tuna vessel was stuck on the reefs outside and was being bashed to bits on the rocks. The old greyhaired skipper shouted down to the green crew to man the boat and to go out.

One of the boys who was only sixteen and had never been out before shouted back, "But, Skipper, the tide is running out and the wind is against us. We can go out, but we can't make it back."

To which the skipper replied, "We have got to go out. We don't have to come back."

The predicament of our time finds people and nations hammering themselves to bits on the rocks. The tide is running out and the wind is against us. Happily we are called to a job like this, not primarily to succeed, but to serve. [Prolonged applause]

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Thank you very much, Sir.

Juan, do you have some information about this reception that should be given to us now?

... Announcements ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Since we are running ahead of time, Dr. Olds has consented to answer some questions which might come from the floor. While we are having these brief announcements, you might be thinking about something you would like to pose to him.

I would like to have Don Gardner and the other members of the committee on Time and Place rise, if they will, so that they may be identified. (The Committee arose) If you have suggestions to make to this Committee, please identify one of them and be sure that you register your suggestions with them.

Will the Committee on Resolutions please rise. (The Committee arose) I hope you identified them because if any member of this Conference has a resolution which they would like to have considered by the Resolutions Committee for presentation to the Conference on Friday these gentlemen are the ones to whom you should direct your suggestions.

Fred, do you have announcements?

... Announcements ...

SECRETARY-TREASURER FRED H. TURNER (University of Illinois): Up at the registration desk there are several publications you may want to pick up. We have this bulletin on the organization of health services from the American Medical Association's Economics Department. They have sent us enough copies for everyone. Help yourselves to that.

Bill Guthrie sent us some papers on orientation.

Jack Matthews from the University of Missouri sent us some new bulletins that are up on the table.

I might add that the Secretary and Treasurer's report is there in mimeographed form, and I hope that you will get a copy of that and see what has become of your money during the past year.

It is going to be important that we get started pretty promptly in the morning, Blair, because we started fifteen minutes late tonight. While thanks to Dr. Olds we moved along, we are going to have to move right straight through or we will get far behind. It is going to be hard and heavy, starting right now.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Tomorrow will certainly be a full day, and I hope we can start promptly at nine o'clock. If we are to get into the two direct presentations, the discussion which will be very important, and then be able to adjourn in time for lunch we must start at nine.

Do you have questions you would like to direct to Dr. Olds? Please don't be bashful. I never in my life saw such a silent crowd in this Conference.

SECRETARY TURNER: I would like to raise one. I would like to ask Dr. Olds if he would like to take a little time and relate this whole thing right into the specific point of cheating on the campus, because that certainly is a matter that is before all of us.

DR. OLDS: Can I use a case study?

SECRETARY TURNER: Use anything you please.

DR. OLDS: Unhappily I trimmed most of the illustrative material tonight, and these bare bones, I fear, may not rise again without the flesh that ought to have clothed them, but I was going to use this case history as an indication of just this point.

While I was speaking in our Chapel about a month ago, somebody stole \$57.00 out of my pocketbook downstairs. The reason I had the \$57.00 was I had just cashed my salary check for the month. [Laughter] But in any case, this is stealing. I will get it into relation to cheating in a second.

It turned out that this was a kind of epidemic that actually we had lost about \$1300.00 at the University of Denver since October. Shortly after that happened they caught the boy who had stolen the money who was, to my great consternation and embarrassment, a major in religion. It is a kind of ironic indication of the dilemma.

I talked to this boy. He was referred to me by the Dean of Students -- I wasn't adopting prerogatives there. He sent him over and I talked to this boy and discovered that the conception of what was mine and thine, kind of an elementary distinction at the level of moral responsibility, had been greatly modified by a prevailing philosophy which I shudder to say he picked up at the University of Denver in the Social Sciences, in particular, which operate on an emphasis upon social maintenance and cultural determinism.

This boy had it all figured out why he stole the money. He came from a very poor home. His mother had stroked him too much as a child. He had run with the wrong crowd. He had been subject to all kinds of insecurities in school, etc. And he didn't really choose to steal the money; he just stole it, you see.

His sense of personal responsibility had been dulled by a pervasive philosophy which had given him a rationale for the inevitable, you see, and had eliminated the necessity for a feeling both of personal responsibility and of personal integrity. That was my way of illustrating this level of philosophy.

This case enabled me then to go to the Dean of the College and say, "I am troubled about any philosophy that we teach which becomes a rationale for what I take ordinary moral sensitivity to condemn," and that I thought we ought to begin to get at that.

You see my suggestion. Is that relevant, about the matter of philosophy?

I will take it at the second level, in terms of transforming the doctrine of man. I said, "You are majoring in religion." (This is a commentary on our religious major at the University of Denver. You won't tell Chancellor Jacobs this weekend, I hope. I want to tell him myself.) I said, "What is your conception of man that permits you to think that there is no fracturing of your sense of manhood by this kind of act?" And his reply was, "Well, we are all children of God." I thought, "Here we go, that sentimental liberal slush -- I am sorry to get emotional about this -- that notion that since we are all children of God and all of us have this elementary charity toward each other. The distinctions between thine and mine are not so crucial any more, and since he was using the money to finance his education, to go on in religion, it didn't occur to him that this was quite as crucial a problem. You see what I mean?"

I think he needed help in terms of understanding what he was, and who he was, in terms of the nature of man.

Finally, in terms of community, I would define a community as a voluntary association bound by consent, tradition and common commitment. I mean, in this very general and snapshot fashion, I asked him whether he thought this kind of act would actually enhance a community. That was my third question. His notion apparently of the meaning of community and his own role in it was that he had actually succeeded for himself at least, in justifying this kind of an act in that kind of community.

I can take one other case of cheating, a little faster. Cheating in a Seminary. I happened to teach in a Seminary before my wife's health moved us to Denver, this wonderful land of the West. In Seminary -- this is kind of ironic and it may be beyond your field, but I think it will illustrate the point that it can happen there.

Cheating became a very real problem in the Seminary, and when several of these cases turned up -- yes, that is great, isn't it? [Laughter] Boy! When the salt hath lost its savor! [Laughter]

In any case the point I am getting at is that almost without exception my generalizations tonight have been drawn from this several years of the living context within which I think we have to try to do this work, and almost without exception the boy who cheats, who is the menace to the community, is the one who has succeeded in justifying his cheating on the basis of a pervasive philosophy and attitude which permeates the community.

Now, it may be a neurotic justification -- that is to say, it may be that the teacher did not give him an "A" when he really deserved it and did not cheat, and the guy who did cheat got an "A", so he figures "If this is the kind of teacher I have, what's the point? I'll cheat too, if I have to, in order to get the "A", and so on.

In terms of emphasis, the emphasis upon credits instead of character, the extensive emphasis on grades rather than assimilation of material and so on tends to create a context of strain and conflict, in my opinion, which renders such a thing as cheating -- I won't say "inevitable" for then I would be over in the school of my Social Science friends -- but certainly predominantly probable. I think the only way we are ever going to deal with that is to deal with it at the level of pervasive philosophy and basic commitment and basic conception of community.

SECRETARY TURNER: That is a nice answer. I like that.

DR. OLDS: I would be quite grateful to you men for your corrective comments. They don't have to be questions. They can be points of criticism.

DEAN JAMES DICKINSON (Carnegie Institute of Technology): Dr. Olds, I wonder if your experience has given you any reason to believe that we, as Deans of Students, have any right to feel optimistic about our possibilities of increasing this level of integrity?

To elaborate just one step further, I have heard it expressed recently by a college president in a rather famous eastern institution that the nature of the college community and the nature of the student are such as to combine in operation to the point that he, at least, felt that there was very little that could be done in colleges upon this very important issue to which we would all subscribe. Essentially that is it. The college defines its job in such a way, and the kid is still egocentric to such a degree that he at least was pessimistic.

DR. OLDS: To speak to that quite directly, and to shed copious tears with such an august body as this over the fact, I happen to believe that Deans of Students who operate, broadly speaking, extra-curricular-wise -- I think that is true of this group, speaking broadly and loosely -- I hope there are no semantic purists among us, or semanticists. [Laughter] In any event, speaking in a broad and loose sense it seems to me that the basic philosophy which animates our curricular setup, our conception of education, and so on, renders the Dean of Students' work, in most places that I have been -- of course, I haven't been at a lot of places obviously. I have been prescribed places that I ought to go, but I haven't been there yet. [Laughter] That tends to make the kind of thing that we are primarily doing what I would call a salvage job; that is to say, rescuing from the main stream and current of the university those sick chicks -- is that too harsh a word? You see what I mean? -- those sick chicks which get fouled up so badly in the machinery and the method and the outlook that their desperation calls them to our attention.

That is a pretty cynical view, perhaps, but I am reasonably persuaded that the hope for us lies in the degree to which this group is able to influence the faculty at large, and also the administration to re-think the broad structure of the university.

Let me illustrate that on two counts. We use the term "university community," and I think both of those are misnomers

for what we have. A university -- now I become a semanticist -- by definition is a community of scholars dedicated to the universal body of experience which comprises the knowledge appropriate to a community of that sort.

In most of our universities that are state-supported, for instance, certain broad segments of human life are eliminated by definition, which would make it impossible for it to be a university. For instance, religion is eliminated. Quite apart from how you may feel about religion personally -- and I speak not as a protagonist for it but as one eager to get in the range of a student what is universal -- to eliminate this and say we will leave it up to the church, these cheating preachers [laughter] -- I shouldn't be that uncharitable [Laughter] -- but to leave it up to the church or the home or what not, the silence is not silence but speaks very loudly.

If my analysis tonight is anywhere sound, a high religion speaks a very definitive word to the point of our problem, both in analysis and in prescription. If we eliminate this from the structure of subject matter which would become the occasion for illumination (we would hope) from the university, it isn't even a university by the grace of God since that too is eliminated. [Laughter]

Secondly, it would seem to me, on the basis of my definition of community, it is not a community either. It is a cluster of vested interests, in many cases, and the Dean of Students is sort of caught between. It seems to me I found that true on most campuses. He becomes the confidant of the faculty. They are as neurotic as the students. [Laughter] Isn't that true? I mean, I am just a chaplain, I hope by the grace of God; certainly not by temperament, or even capacity I suppose. But I find that almost as many faculty come into my office -- and I think not to look at my books, because there aren't many -- as students, and the dilemma of our campus, which is probably not typical because it has mushroomed and become so large so quick; but in any event the elements of community, namely, trust, confidence, integrity, principle, self-transcending ideals, are often missing in the structure of that community and students.

I have had sixteen of the leading students on the campus in our homes for five successive weeks now. I gave up with the religious council. Talk about salvaging sick chicks! These weren't hatched yet. [Laughter] I asked the campus leaders in, and the almost universal subscription of the campus leaders was that the sense of conflict between the faculty, jockeying for position -- this is true all over, I understand -- with the

shrinking of course offerings and the insecurity about tomorrow, and now UMT -- we have to worry about that for another year possibly -- all of this insecurity puts the campus in this position of conflict and of jockeying for power. The student picks that up, and he says, "What the dickens, Olds, when these men who have a college education can't even get together in terms of a community, what am I doing here? What has it got to do with the price of eggs in China? I'm going back to the bricks."

I don't know whether that speaks to your question.

DEAN DICKINSON: That doesn't make us more optimistic.
[Laughter]

DR. OLDS: I want to tell you, part of the hope probably lies in making more of you college presidents. [Laughter] Now, I mean, there is hope there, I hope. Is there? [Laughter]
We'll know tomorrow, eh? [Laughter]

Do we have time for one more question or comment?

DEAN JOHN R. WEIR (Clinical Psychologist, California Institute of Technology): If I understood you correctly, Dr. Olds, you remarked about the pervasive philosophy of your \$57.00-student and seemed to attribute his rationalization for his stealing to the philosophy he had picked up in social sciences. Is this correct?

DR. OLDS: No, that is too narrow, certainly -- a strong emphasis there.

DEAN WEIR: I take it this was the discussion you had with the president or one of the deans.

DR. OLDS: Yes.

DEAN WEIR: The question I have is, what specific recommendations would you suggest for changing the presentation of the social sciences in such a way as to eliminate this philosophy you pointed out?

DR. OLDS: Did you get the question? What specific suggestions would I make, or did I make, to the dean concerning the broad field of the social sciences, out of regard for this student who justified his stealing on the basis of an influence that he derived from that quarter? Is that roughly the question?

DEAN WEIR: Yes.

DR. OLDS: The first thing -- and I have been sort of harping on this since September -- is that the social sciences become scientific in this sense: That it attend to all of the data and that it handle the data from within the framework of its intrinsic character. To illustrate, when a social scientist handles the phenomenon of religion -- there is a case in point with which I am more familiar -- very often he knows nothing about religion from the inside, except a visceral twitch he picked up in Sunday School and is trying to forget. [Laughter] You see? I know I am loading these terms a little, [Laughter] but I feel this pretty strongly. This is my point: He presumes that in matters of life and decision and ultimate loyalty there is a neutral position. This is the fiction, in my opinion, of that kind of objectivity which says that the ideal for science is neutrality; whereas actually these social scientists that I have in mind -- I have been down at the University of Texas where a very substantial number are being generated, I think -- what is his name? Professor Ayer down there, a very top-flight mind. This notion of neutrality deludes the student into thinking that the instructor is neutral, whereas actually he is passionately committed either to neutrality, in which case he is a good scientist which means he is not neutral about neutrality. This is his commitment. That is my point.

But students think he is neutral. He is not neutral about neutrality.

My theory is, it is better to be damned than to be ignored; that is, that we ought to tell students where we stand in dealing with anything of material or fact.

What this student got from his instructors was that from a neutral position religion is so much superstition. In the language of Karl Marx -- of course, he would not have quoted Karl Marx in this time--forgive my red tie [laughter] -- he could have quoted: "It is an opiate of the people. It is all right for old women and little children, as a helpful crutch to get over the hump, but for serious minded men it is not to be taken seriously. Hence this is eliminated in the name of scientific objectivity."

My suggestion to the Dean was that in the handling of certain areas of human experience, such as ethics and religion, both of which bear directly on this matter of personal responsibility, that you at least inquire of your teachers whether they have any firsthand experience with the data which they are seeking to interpret to their students. That seemed to me fair.

Secondly, that you ask the instructors to make explicit their presupposition, either methodological or philosophical, in the handling of this particular area. Make it articulate. Make what is implicit, explicit.

Third, that with regard to this element of decision and personal integrity and personal responsibility that it is the burden of the professor in his honesty with the subject matter to make it clear to the student where he does stand with respect to concrete principles of action, which the student will generally assimilate secondhand from his professor, but will have never examined critically in the classroom.

That is one side of it. Of course the second side of the tack -- and this betrays my own training and bias as a presumptive philosopher out of his field -- I think that we need to have a kind of cross-fertilization at a faculty level which prevents this compartmentalized view which gives the student a fragmented outlook and vitiates in conflict his understanding.

As far as I know, on our faculty, very little of that is going on.

DEAN ANTHONY C. O'FLYNN (Dean of Students, Loyola University of New Orleans): Dr. Olds, I would like, as a clergyman, to point up if I can what you said this evening which impressed me very much.

As long as we have on campuses relativism in philosophy, or a collectivism in religion, I think that the answer to Dean Turner's question is an impossible situation because we cannot hold a student to a code of morals unless we have a definite code of morals, or unless we have a definite framework of dogma to back up that code of morals.

I think if a student is tempted to cheat in an examination, or do something else in the school which is contrary to the moral law, he would not be prevented from that because we tell him something about a sense of community or sense of fellowship or just a general sense of obligation. Chatterton said that the trouble with the Victorian Era was that they were trying to preserve morality without any dogma to back it up.

I might add that that is the only reason for the existence of all the Catholic colleges in the United States, that we want to try to preserve this framework of dogma and morality, and present it to the students; and we realize of course that because of our government that cannot be done in a state university where

everyone has an equal right to present his own morality, or, as you brought out, a lack of morality which is in itself a definite philosophy.

So I would like to point out that I have appreciated your talk very much, and I think that that is the solution, that somehow or other it must be gotten over to the academic deans and heads of universities that some definite code of morality, based on a dogma -- for example, the existence of a God and Creator and moral law -- must be put in. Otherwise, what is the use of morality?

DR. OLDS: Can I make a comment to that? Time is late but I would like a minute to comment on that.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Surely.

DR. OLDS: The dilemma of your suggestion for most of us in this room, I imagine, is that on most colleges -- I will be explicit. On our particular campus, for instance, the dilemma is that a university community generally has as one of its principles, in this country at least, the encouragement of continual critical view of the presuppositions under which it operates. I like that, and I think any university community which overlooks the imperative of a critical review of its presuppositions is likely to end not in dogma but in dogmatism, which I use loosely to describe the refusal to look any further for truth.

The dilemma, in my opinion, on most of our campuses is that we have in reacting to an earlier authoritarianism, "This is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth" -- some Freshman said, "Let's not get emphatic about it." [Laughter] You see, that is reacting against in the name of a liberal mind; that is to say, a mind liberated to enquire for itself into the evidence and argument for truth has tended, in my opinion, to swing to the other pole of subjectivism. "You like geraniums, I like God, so what? There is a movie, oh, let's go." [Laughter]

This mood prevents what, from my point of view, is imperative and that is that a university community retain this same critical demand. I have difficulty with the Catholic Chaplain, to be quite concrete about it, at the University of Denver over this particular issue. That is to say, I have suggested that the Catholic philosophy ought to be heard, and I am eager to have it heard, but it ought to be heard on the same ground, namely, in terms of evidence and in terms of argument. This is what makes it a candidate for a university community and for that critical review. For those who are willing to get their philosophy out in

the open I think this must be done. In the interests of finding some ground of moral integrity, which of course in my opinion is religious and moral responsibility, that is the framework and perspective, but whatever the perspective -- this is my point -- it must be made articulate and it must be subject to that kind of critical review.

The thing I fear on the part of many of the religious groups on our campus is the refusal to meet the first condition in the interest of maintaining the second; the refusal, that is to say, to entertain critically the review of the presuppositions that define its faith.

You have been awfully charitable, and I appreciate very much coming down, and I am sorry we intruded a bit on the time you did give me. [Applause]

PRESIDENT KNAPP: We appreciate it very much. I think this evening we have been given enough to think about over night.

With that, we stand adjourned.

... The Conference recessed at nine-twenty o'clock ...

THURSDAY MORNING SESSION

April 3, 1952

The Conference reconvened at nine-ten o'clock, President Knapp presiding.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: May we come to order, please. I think Fred has a few announcements for us.

... Announcements ...

SECRETARY TURNER: I think, Blair, we should publicly thank George Zimmerman who played the piano for us last night at the reception. George is sitting back here some place. He played piano all evening for our entertainment, and seemed to be perfectly willing to do it, so I think we ought to thank him. [Applause] George is one of Bob Miner's boys from Miami University.

I have two announcements about State meetings.

... Announcements ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: The Executive Committee was congratulating itself yesterday that for the first time in the history of the Association it had not been necessary to change the program. That was up to yesterday at five o'clock. Bob Strozier's plane got grounded in Albuquerque this morning or last night. He will not be here until noon, so Dean Hunt of Swarthmore kindly consented to substitute for him at this moment.

I am going to turn this program over to Erich Walter, Dean of Michigan, who will be the moderator for this most interesting program this morning. Erich.

... Dean Erich A. Walter, Dean of Students, University of Michigan, assumed the Chair ...

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Thank you. As Fred said last night, we have work to do and we have quite a lot of it coming up this morning.

Let me remind you that the topic of the Conference is "How Can We Effectively Develop a Sense of Higher Standards of Personal Integrity and Individual Responsibility in the University and College Community."

This morning we have a panel of four speakers, and I should like to have them all stand after I call their names.

To my left, to your right, Dr. Bryant Wedge, University Health Service, University of Chicago; Dr. Dana Farnsworth, Director, Health Service, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

To my right, to your left, Dean Bowditch of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and Dean Everett Hunt of Swarthmore College. Dean Hunt, as you know, is pinchhitting for Bob Strozier who was grounded in Albuquerque.

We are going to run our meeting in this fashion: There are going to be four speeches, the two psychiatrists, followed by the two Deans. Then I shall declare a breather and we will get together after that breather to get at these people, to needle them as much as we can, and to get as much information as we can.

Our first speaker, Dr. Bryant Wedge, University Health Service, University of Chicago, will speak on this subject: "Discussion of Relations Between the Dean and the College Psychiatrist." Dr. Wedge. [Applause]

DR. BRYANT WEDGE (University Health Service, University of Chicago): Thank you. President Knapp, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Panel, Members of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators: We were devastated this morning to learn that Dean Strozier could not be with us, because we wanted particularly to demonstrate to you, in life as it were, that Deans and psychiatrists do get along, and at least in some situations come to understand each other pretty well. We are buoyed up by the presence of Dean Hunt, who I think will be a good substitute for Dean Strozier, and who we can understand also.

We are really on the subject of integrity and responsibility, but instead of continuing in the philosophical discussion we will rather combat the pessimism that may come out of too much philosophy by talking about action, and go on into an operational discussion of the particular activities that the psychiatrist and deans have engaged in together in forwarding the concepts of responsibility and integrity amongst students.

My paper is entitled, "The Dean and the College Psychiatrist -- Areas of Cooperation."

The association of psychiatrists with college programs is now past the experimental stage in many places. This event is the result of separate developments in the fields of college education and of psychiatry. Development in education are well known to you; the growing recognition of the necessity of educating the whole person if he is to function in a truly enlightened manner,

and the discoveries by educators, sociologists, and psychologists of the relation between what may be called emotional adjustment and the ability to learn.

You are probably less aware of the changes in psychiatry which have served to interest psychiatrists in education and to increase their usefulness to it. As a medical specialty, psychiatry for many decades interested itself mainly in classifying disease of the mind and doing little else except applying such remedies as came to hand. In the last half-century, with the scientific study of concepts of emotional growth, maturity and unconscious motivation, a new cause-seeking and dynamically-oriented discipline has arisen. Not only has this increased the possibility of treatment and cure of emotional disorders but it has brought new understanding to a whole range of normal processes such as adolescence and learning. Thus it is that the psychiatrist begins to be able to be of some usefulness in the scheme of education.

The purpose of this discussion is to describe how the psychiatrist works in relation to that particularly important member of the educational team, the Dean of Students. I will use our experience at the University of Chicago as a vehicle for this purpose. Robert Strozier's readiness to understand and the confidence which he has placed in the psychiatric clinic of the Student Health Service have made the collaboration a successful one. Mrs. Ruth McCarn, as Assistant Dean and her predecessor John Bergstresser; John Davey, Dean of Students in the College, as well as others of Mr. Strozier's associates, have reflected these attitudes so faithfully that I shall speak of them as one, although the functions to be mentioned may have occurred chiefly in relation to one or another of them.

The purely medical and treatment functions of the college psychiatrist might seem at first glance to have little meaning for the Dean. In fact, the treatment of students is an area which requires such great respect of confidences that individual cases are not discussed with him. The Dean is, however, properly concerned with problems of student failure, social adjustment, and even standards of health. I should explain that at the University of Chicago the Health Service is a responsibility of the Dean of Students and that the emphasis there is on prevention of disease, in addition to treatment after it occurs. This philosophy extends to the psychiatric clinic where we interest ourselves in the prevention of failure of emotional adjustment with its often consequent academic and social failure, by the prompt availability of consultation and, if the problem is amenable to briefer methods, treatment. Our case-finders are numerous; the Dean and his staff, advisors, professors and dormitory officials, but above all the

students themselves are quick to sense a disordered integration and bring the attention of the student to his need for help. This might strike you as bringing the risk of over-emphasis and abuse, yet over the years less than two per cent of such referrals have been found to be without real basis, and even in these some good is often done.

It is difficult to estimate how much our treatment activity has accomplished in preventing students from failing or becoming disciplinary problems or worse, and thus becoming of immediate concern to the Dean of Students. Suffice it to say that the gratification of such work is great to the psychiatrist who enjoys seeing students become able to realize their potentialities. It is to be expected that emotionally upset people will become conspicuous problems to the Dean. The ability of the psychiatrist to make judgments about such problems and even to remove persons presenting them from the college community by hospitalizing them if they are dangerously upset, or recommending a leave of absence for medical reasons, may protect them from getting into more serious difficulties.

Such action is taken solely on the basis of the student's welfare, never for the convenience of administration, but frequently the two coincide. For example, it is never in a student's interest to mess up his affairs academically or socially and it may be embarrassing to an administration for this to occur. If such events are highly probable, the student may be advised to leave college until he can get straightened out. I am pleased to be able to affirm that this is often extremely constructive action; a majority of those so advised have returned later with greater maturity and are succeeding as never before.

We have extended the function of evaluating the emotional capabilities of students for the work and life in college to the selection of students. This work with the Office of Admissions, which at Chicago reports to the Dean's Office, was stimulated by the observation that the usual criteria for admission failed to screen out a number of students who fairly soon demonstrated their unfitness for what they were doing. They not only presented problems to the University but found themselves dissatisfied.

Mr. Strozier encouraged us to discuss this with the admitting officers and we soon developed a workable program of consultation. It proved to be feasible for us to interview applicants who fulfilled ordinary criteria but who raised misgivings in the minds of the admissions people. We encouraged these officers to test their intuitive misgivings by sending such applicants to us with a forthright explanation of the referral.

The results have been interesting. We discovered a number of seriously disturbed people who could not possibly have gotten along in college and could be redirected to treatment or to healthier occupations for themselves. Others, not actually ill have presented grossly inappropriate motivations for seeking admission -- for example, to escape family conflicts which they have been unable to deal with or to satisfy the demands of ambitious parents. Such motives do not make for success in students; in fact, they may constitute powerful blocks to success and can even lead the student to act in troublesome ways. Quite a number of applicants in this category can achieve some understanding of their problems in a single interview and may decide on more constructive solutions to immediate problems, finally approaching college with more maturity. Equally interesting are the students who have had uneven or scholastically poor careers in past situations but who have overcome the basis for their difficulties and are ready to approach college work with realistic attitudes. Some of this group who might not ordinarily have been considered suitable candidates have made brilliant records for themselves.

As you see, the psychiatrist's job here is two-fold -- first to protect the student from undertaking tasks for which he is not prepared or help him become able to deal with them, and second to save the University from investing in people who would fail or make for troublesome problems.

Students who are referred by the Dean or his staff for evaluation for admission or in regard to disciplinary action are always informed that the psychiatrist will make his opinions known to the Dean. This permits us to discuss some of the problems involved to our mutual advantage. Thus the admissions officers have been able to sharpen their abilities in selection; the psychiatrist has been educated in problems of administration and led to broader perspectives.

The Dean's office routinely sends students involved in serious disciplinary problems to us for evaluation before the disciplinary committee begins its study of the case. The University looks on disciplinary action as an attempt to solve problems, rather than a purely punitive activity. Some students presenting such problems have been found to be grossly disturbed -- in these instances the problem becomes a medical one and appropriate steps are taken. In most cases the psychiatrist is able to learn something of the motive for behavior leading to the necessity for discipline and can suggest action which will tend to relieve the problem. Interestingly, such recommendations are sometimes in the direction of more strict action than the behavior itself might call for. For example, a young student may be caught

stealing books from a need to call attention to his anxiety about being free from the close control his parents had offered. Failure to give him the security of positive action would lead to greater anxiety and more blatant asocial activity. The Dean has dealt with this function so carefully that students do not generally regard the psychiatrist as an officer of the administration, which would certainly destroy his usefulness. Rather, they tend to look upon the psychiatrist as an interpreter of their needs to the administration, which he attempts to be. Again in this activity there is opportunity for communication between the Dean and the psychiatrist so that we come to understand the needs of students better and can learn ways of meeting them.

Whether or not the dormitory system is under the jurisdiction of the Dean as it is at Chicago, the living situations of students are certainly of concern to him. Dormitory life brings with it many special problems in personal relations, some of which are difficult to solve by administrative action alone. We have made ourselves available to the dormitory officials in regard to these. Here, in addition to helping work out problems as they arise, we have been able to engage in preventive activities. In our contributions to the indoctrination and orientation of house heads and floor heads, we have tried to alert them to the usual reactions to dormitory life and how they may be dealt with. More important is the work of demonstrating to them their responsibilities toward their students; of showing them that only by exemplifying responsible attitudes in their jobs can they cultivate individual self responsibility in the young people around them. It is remarkable how easy it is in the era of demands for freedoms for the price of freedom to be forgotten. The price is responsibility.

The group of young house heads is always inclined to feel that far-reaching permissiveness is the attitude to take toward their charges, forgetting that most college entrants are not quite prepared to deal with this and may become quite upset by it, manifesting their anxiety in a variety of ways, few of them conducive to a good adjustment. When they can be shown that it is their responsibility to set some limits to freedom in the dormitory, and that by taking this responsibility they both gain the students' respect and make them more comfortable, they become much more effective.

It might be said that the need to learn to take personal responsibilities of this kind seems to be a general one in this society. It is only when this has been learned that education for responsible living can be effective. This is not, of course, a viewpoint championed only by psychiatrists but an approach which

many educators have adopted. Pitfalls of a healthy attitude toward responsibility lie on both sides -- on the one hand the idea of unlimited permission, on the other the danger of a too repressive and restrictive approach. You have probably seen, as I have, examples of both extremes and their sad results.

The same functions which I have described in relation to admission officers and dormitory officials have been repeated in their different ways in other special situations, with advisors, with the medical personnel of the Student Health Service and with administrative groups of various graduate divisions and schools of the University. The aim of such work is always to understand as much as possible of the requirements of each situation and to strengthen the understanding in the persons concerned of the emotional or interpersonal significance of their work. Since one of the psychiatrist's tasks is to interpret the emotional needs of students to the Dean and his personnel, we believe that he must always stay close to the job of treatment to remain effective in this.

It is the intention of the University to educate students to be ready to assume responsibility in wider areas of life. Hence, the psychiatric staff has taken some share in educative activities. We have provided discussions of sexual adjustment in college. These have been conducted along group dynamic lines with the aim of diminishing anxiety rising from this area and emphasizing the dignity and importance of taking individual responsibility for conduct. The need in this area came as a surprise to us; we had assumed that college age students would have settled on satisfactory solutions to their sexuality. As we have learned, many are not yet ready to meet the actual situation of dormitory pressures, freedom from parental supervision, etc., in spite of much theoretical knowledge. Actually, students of all ages have been generally grateful for these sessions. We have not engaged in extensive educational activities, health courses, and so on, because this has not seemed to us to be the psychiatrist's real job, although in other colleges such programs seem to have contributed a great deal.

The purpose of this enumeration of some of the activities in which we engage in close concert with the Dean of Students has been to illustrate the grounds for collaboration and something of the psychiatrist's contributions. I would now like to speak about the kind of relationship which makes such collaboration fruitful, and again I must be personal, for my knowledge comes chiefly from my experience with Dean Strozier. That this is not unique is evidenced by the success of such collaborative programs in other schools.

The first requisite for a successful collaboration lies in a clear understanding and definition of responsibilities. This is actually well defined by the respective disciplines of psychiatry, a medical specialty, and academic administration, a discipline combined from education and administration. It should be clear at once that there is no conflict of working area between these so that no confusion of responsibility should occur. In our case, the Dean has never made any attempt to practice medicine or to tell us how to do so, nor has he in any instance questioned medical-psychiatric recommendations or opinions, although on occasion we have discussed the rationale of certain recommendations without violating any professional confidence. The psychiatric staff, on the other hand, have had no need to question administrative decisions. The truth is that we agree on the idea of the need to require social and academic responsibility from students if they are to have the privilege of college training.

There are times when the psychiatrist becomes aware of an administrative policy which he thinks is psychologically unsound, and he would be remiss in his duties if he did not try to change it. As an example of this, we have discussed, along with others, the wisdom of segregating young entering students in the dormitory system. Similarly, the Dean has no hesitancy at all in telling us when he thinks we might just possibly be straining the limits of medical responsibility in our activities. Obviously, this requires respect for the professional abilities of each other; should there be doubt on this score, working together would be impossible.

Another requisite is certainly that the business relationship remain a professional one, between specialists in their separate fields. This makes for a certain degree of formality in our consultations, which of course, need not interfere with friendship. This may have made for a split personality in Dr. Farnsworth when some time ago he handled both jobs (I hope he will talk about that) but I'm sure he remained friends with himself.

Lastly, I believe that these mutual efforts depend on an attitude which must be shared, compounded of a wish to learn, willingness to change or even experiment, and a tolerance for some degree of fallibility.

I expect to be pardoned for speaking to personal administrators about an administrative relationship on the grounds that the one which I have described is of a special type which may be fairly unique. For my part, there is a great deal of pleasure in meeting with you to talk about something about which I am, as you see, most enthusiastic. [Applause]

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Thank you very much, Dr. Wedge.

Dr. Farnsworth will speak on the subject, "Potential Problem Areas." Dr. Farnsworth.

DR. DANA FARNSWORTH (Director, Health Service, Massachusetts Institute of Technology): Dean Walter, Gentlemen: One of the most delicate problems that surrounds the proper function of a physician, and particularly a psychiatrist, in a college setting is that of preserving the confidential nature of the physician-patient relationship.

As all of you are well aware, anything which the patient divulges during the course of a medical interview may not be used by the physician without the patient's permission, unless the welfare of others is directly at stake, as would be the case if the patient had a communicable disease. In the psychiatric field there are certain close parallels, such as the presence in the patient of definite overt suicidal or homicidal tendencies. Leaving these extremes out of consideration, the patient should feel free to communicate his true ideas and feelings to the psychiatrist without fear that they will be related to others and used against him in any way. Let there be a violation of confidence on a college campus and immediately the news spreads, and the usefulness of the psychiatrist is virtually at an end.

From the standpoint of the referring faculty member or dean the problem is not so clear cut as that. He feels a certain responsibility to the student, his family and the college. He would like to know what was found, whether he can help further, what his attitude is to be in future conferences with the student, and what can be done to help other students who may have similar problems. If he calls the psychiatrist, asks about the student, and is told that the confidential physician-patient relationship prevents his saying anything about the problem, he is not going to feel very happy about the situation. On the other hand, if the psychiatrist does give a general outline of his findings, and the faculty member tells this to the patient, the psychiatrist will properly be blamed. The middle ground that is possibly most satisfactory is that in which the psychiatrist discusses general problems faced by students without bringing in private personal material. In this way the faculty member gains some insight into the nature of the problem without having details given him. But even that much information must be handled discreetly by him.

The sharing of information with the parents of a patient is a somewhat different problem. If parents ask for an interview, they obviously must be granted it. If the patient knows they are

coming, his permission should be obtained if any information is to be divulged. If permission is not granted, then the psychiatrist gets all the information from the parents he can obtain, pointing out that it is for the good of the patient. At the same time he resists demands for information with the obvious reason that to do so would tend to destroy the treatment relationship. If the student is incapable of using good judgment, the parents are, of course, then given whatever information is necessary for them to make wise and appropriate decisions.

Another type of complication is the situation that arises when a student in the course of an interview discloses that he is violating some of the basic rules or customs of the dormitory in which he lives. If the psychiatrist reports such a violation to the Dean's Office, he will get no similar information in the future either from this student or from others who hear about the episode. If, on the contrary, he does nothing about it at all, he might be accused of not trying to support the standards of the college. The average psychiatrist would, I believe, not report such episodes to any administrative office but would try to help the student understand that such deviant behavior would work to his disadvantage in the long run. He could, after the lapse of suitable time, indicate the general nature of the problem, so that student government officials and others concerned could try to prevent future violations. As a general rule, a psychiatrist does not find one violation without finding others, and he can then discuss the whole problem without harming any one individual.

Not long ago one of the members of our staff was consulted by a student who had gotten himself into trouble with the legal authorities, and the episode might possibly affect his relationship with the college itself. He was told by the psychiatrist that he should by all means notify the proper college officials of his predicament, and that this would probably make it easier for him than if he tried to cover up his acts still further. The manner of divulging this information was left up to him. Unfortunately he did not choose to do this before the information became available to the college officials from other sources.

Although it is very risky to have any publicity about the matter, it is usually advisable for the psychiatrist and the dean to have a close working relationship so that the dean can be aware of the psychiatrist's problems and similarly the psychiatrist can understand the dean's viewpoint. If the dean does not take a punitive attitude towards students but instead tries to get at the meaning of their behavior, the psychiatrist can be of very great help to him. If the dean looks upon every variant from

accepted social behavior as a challenge to his authority, then communication between the two offices must of necessity be very scanty.

One of the difficult problems that any psychiatrist faces who tries to work in a college setting is that of preventing himself from being overwhelmed by the demands for conferences with individual students. If a psychiatrist does succumb to this pressure he limits his usefulness quite sharply and becomes merely a technical aid for disturbed students and is of little value in preventing emotional disturbance. The best ratio of time spent with students and with faculty and administrative members is yet to be determined, but in my opinion is about fifty-fifty. The more a psychiatrist can help the individual faculty member with his counseling problems, the better off the entire institution will be. Every time a professor or the dean works through a delicate situation with some professional help in the background, the more capable he is of solving the next situation effectively.

The psychiatrist's main responsibility to the college is to awaken an awareness or a sensitivity to this great range of personal problems. It is not his purpose to develop amateur psychologists out of the teachers. His job is to help them to become better teachers. To be good teachers they should be good counselors. Every contact with the student is in reality a counseling situation. The development of an adequate counseling program might well be the joint responsibility of deans and psychiatrists together with other related disciplines.

Some teachers are very suspicious of acquiring any of the newer techniques of counseling because they fear that there is some kind of regimentation back of the whole idea. They may say that pediatricians and child psychiatrists have developed new techniques only to drop them when still newer ideas come along, and they do not want to become dated similarly by acquiring confining techniques.

Counseling is a process, a point of view, a way of approaching all sorts of new and unfamiliar situations, a set of attitudes and not a fixed technique. The type of counseling I am talking about is designed toward freeing the individual from his internal conflicts rather than regimenting him in any way. The counselor in this sense should be a good listener. He makes no moral judgments on the material that is given him. He knows that for many problems there is no answer but that a mere formulation of the problem will make it objective enough for the student to make either a constructive attack on it or a sensible defense against it.

Many counselors think that their function is to give the student advice. Such is rarely necessary or appropriate. The student needs to develop independence and confidence in himself. He may request the teacher's frank opinion on a given question and get it, but he weighs this against contrasting opinions of other teachers and then makes his own choice.

It is easy to give lip service to this concept of counselling but very difficult to get it across in a college setting. Some teachers make easy and stimulating contacts with students without any training. Others are very insensitive to the subtle reactions of their students. There is much that can be learned, however, if a desire can be inculcated in the members of the faculty to learn more about this field and if they have a chance to work out their feelings in small groups. Sometimes such small groups or seminars can be based largely on the methods of handling typical classroom situations. In other groups a deeper level of understanding is sought for, and the members who participate in it study their own emotional reactions in the group setting, criticize each other vigorously but kindly, and when they understand their own reactions, they are in a position to appreciate the reactions of their students.

A most delicate question that arises from time to time in all schools is what to do about the social deviant, the person whose heterosexual development is not complete. I find it advisable to treat such an individual in exactly the same way as the so-called normal person. If he violates the privacy of someone else, then he must take the consequences just as does the student who offends a member of the opposite sex. Any student who asks for psychiatric help, should receive it on a private, confidential basis. Such cases can be, and are, helped frequently.

This attitude does not increase the frequency of socially unacceptable behavior. The advantages of normal behavior are too great for that. Some schools have a reputation for getting rid of students of whose behavior they do not approve and then pride themselves on having solved the problem. I have not seen any school yet that has solved its problems successfully in this way. Treating such persons as patients, which they really are, does offer hope of satisfactory rehabilitation.

In our relationships with the faculty we try to stress the important point that the psychiatric service does not want any special favors granted to students with emotional problems that would not be granted under similar circumstances to students who had physical ailments. This principle is somewhat difficult in its administration. It is quite obvious that a student with a

broken leg may have to be out of class for a week or even a month. It is frequently not so obvious why a student with an emotional problem should be permitted to miss classes.

The chief reason why we do not want a student to get any secondary gains from his illness is that it is not good for him in that it does not mobilize his own efforts toward recovery. It often happens that a student sees the obvious advantages in having one or two courses dropped from his schedule, and then he conceives the idea that it would be nice if his four years of work could be spread out over five or more years. This we never recommend from the psychiatric point of view. If some alteration is recommended for the student's schedule, it is strictly understood that it shall be for one semester and shall not be a permanent thing. To make a permanent alteration would be to cheapen the degree which the institution confers.

A difficult situation sometimes arises when in the opinion of the psychiatrist the student is too ill to remain in school and yet neither the student nor his family are convinced of this fact. In such a situation we make a recommendation to the Dean that the student be given a medical leave of absence and that his return be conditioned upon a satisfactory report from his psychiatrist or from our own medical department or both. It then becomes an administrative problem as to whether the Dean wants to give him this leave of absence whether he wishes it or not.

We prefer that psychiatrists have no power to enforce any of their recommendations. On the other hand we do have the feeling that if our recommendations are not followed and the reasons for not so doing are not satisfactory, that it is probably time to get a new psychiatrist. This may seem like "a distinction without a difference," but I think it is a very vital one. The physician or psychiatrist should not be put into the position of usurping the power of the regular administrative officers of the college. They should be kept as consultants. Their ultimate value to the administration will be much greater if this distinction is clearly understood by both the administration and the student body.

Occasionally a complication arises when a student is requested to take a leave of absence and pressure is applied to have him continue in school. One time when we made this recommendation to a student, he objected very strenuously over a period of a few hours and was strongly seconded by his father and the rest of his family. As a final gesture, he said that if we did not change our minds and let him remain in school, he would commit

suicide. I informed him that if he did so, it would merely prove the wisdom of our decisions, and as it turned out, he did not.

Direct and indirect threats of suicide are not infrequently used by a certain type of patient in order that he may gain his end, but both deans and psychiatrists must have the courage not to let this threat cause them to make decisions which are not in the best interest of the patient and his family in the long run. The dangerously suicidal patient can usually be differentiated from the above type.

Occasionally a student may request a leave of absence a week or two before the end of a semester, and his reasons may seem entirely adequate to the psychiatrist. After it is granted the student then may have a change of heart and decide that he wants to come back to the college the following semester. This we never agree to unless the circumstances are quite unusual and they are thoroughly understood by all parties concerned. We indicate to such a student that if his emotional disturbance is of such a nature that he should be allowed to have his registration cancelled, that it is very unlikely that any major recovery can be made without treatment or without some life experience which will help him resolve his problem. Mere statement of intent on the part of the patient is not sufficient.

Dean Bowditch and I have talked a great deal in recent months about the question of the general attitude of the institution toward variations from what is considered to be the usual expected behavior.

Near the end of every semester there are always a few students who want special favors and who think that by making out a case for an emotional disturbance of several weeks' standing they can be excused for a poor showing in one or more classes. In almost all instances we point out to the student that such a procedure is unwise and that he must be held responsible for all his work. If this policy is consistently held, such requests are apt to remain few in number. Furthermore, care in these matters tends to maintain confidence in the judgment of the medical staff on the part of faculty and administrative staff members.

The problems involving leave of absence are particularly acute now that there is a national crisis and the question of military service is always in the minds of the students.

For lack of a better term we have used the phrase "permissive attitude" to describe a point of view which we think is healthy in a college. This is not what it might seem to imply,

namely that anything goes, but rather that the level of tolerance of the college community is quite high for all kinds of variations from what is usually expected.

The variation may take the form of some kind of an emotional disturbance, an acting out of a personal problem in terms of behavior, some degree of character disorder, eccentricity in dress or manners, or variations in belief or ideology. Adopting a permissive attitude does not mean that the institution does not have definite and high standards. It does mean that standards are treated as ideals, with slow, steady pressure directed toward their maintenance. It means that the individual is given prime consideration. If the standards are interpreted and enforced with rigidity, this tends to produce hostility on the part of the students involved. If, on the other hand, the standards are expressed in definite terms but with great understanding of the personal predicament or past history of the student concerned, then the deviant behavior will tend to gradually come back to an acceptable level and the student will have to solve his conflict in terms of the demands within himself rather than being able to project them out to the environment, thus blaming someone else for his shortcomings. We feel that a genuine permissive attitude on the part of a great majority of the college members is really a source of strength rather than weakness.

Mark Hopkins expressed some aspects of this problem in his inaugural address at Williams College in 1836.

"The last objection against colleges which I shall notice, comes from another quarter, and is, that they do not teach manners. And it must be confessed that this is not one of those things for which we give a diploma. Good manners certainly ought to exist, and to be acquired in colleges, and more ought to be done on this point than is done. Still there are difficulties in the way which will be appreciated by every sensible man. In the first place, manners can not be taught by direct inculcation; they must mainly depend on parents and on associates during the earlier years of life. Again, many of those who come to college are of such an age that it would be impossible to remodel their manners entirely under the most favorable circumstances. They seem to have lost the power, which indeed some never had of perceiving the difference between the easy intercourse of good fellowship which is consistent with self-respect and respect towards others, and a coarse familiarity which is consistent with neither. There is further apt to be a sentiment prevalent among young men, than which no mistake could be greater, that manners are of little importance, and that to be slovenly and slouching, and perhaps well nigh disrespectful, is a mark of independence. After all,

college is not, in some respects, a bad place to wear off rustiness and break down timidity. And if those who make the complaint could see the transformation and improvement which really take place in many, I may say in most instances in a college course, they would perhaps wonder that so much is accomplished, rather than complain that there is so little. Still, when a young man comes with a frame of granite rough from the mountains, or as rough as he came from them, and has seen perhaps nothing of polite society, and knows nothing of polite literature, it cannot be expected that he should learn during his college course the manners of the drawing room, or the arbitrary forms of fashionable etiquette. If he shall possess, as perhaps such men oftenest do, that higher form of politeness which consists in respecting the feelings of others and consulting their happiness, and we can send him into the world with a sound head and a warm heart to labor for the good of the world, we shall be satisfied, and the world ought to be thankful. Such men often become the pillars of society."

The attitude toward the psychiatrist differs greatly in different college campuses. Many of us find that our services are not only welcomed but are considered almost indispensable. I am told that on some college campuses, however, the psychiatrist is looked upon with something less than enthusiasm, and that his way of thinking seems to be quite foreign to the problems encountered by college administrators.

I have even known of an occasional psychiatrist who has been on the staff of large institutions and who could not find enough to do. This invariably means that something is not quite right, either in the attitude of the college officials, or of the psychiatrist, or both.

If a psychiatric service is to be useful, there should be frequent communication between the psychiatrist and other college officials and there must be mutual confidence. A college psychiatrist is not an empire builder. It is not the function of the college to become an adjunct to a sanatorium. A college should not be expected to be responsible for long term treatment of its students. In a sense the psychiatrist should be working to make his services unnecessary. Unfortunately that looks like only an ideal for the next few decades at least. There are some areas of education, noticeably law, where the study of human behavior is rather rigorously excluded in the sense that the psychiatrist views it. This seems to us a little peculiar in that law is the one profession that is so intimately concerned with disturbances in interpersonal relationships.

The psychiatrist is most useful in a college when his acceptance by other faculty members and by students is such that he may serve as an additional agency in the structure of the institution working toward the attainment of emotionally mature points of view in all concerned. In such a position he must be as ready to learn as he is eager to teach. Only when he functions more or less as a catalytic agent in the process of education for emotional maturity is he being used to the greatest advantage. It is hoped, however, that in the process he, too, will be changed for the better. [Applause]

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Thank you very much, Dr. Farnsworth.

We are now going to move to the Deans on the panel, and in moving to the Deans please do not get the idea that we are setting them up in antagonism to the psychiatrists. Not at all. We are going to put them into teams right after we get into our give and take.

We shall hear now from Dean E. Francis Bowditch of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Dean Bowditch.

DEAN E. FRANCIS BOWDITCH (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): Gentlemen, I approach this from two bits of background, if you will, first as an administrator, first at the secondary level and only very recently at the college level, who found that he had to learn how to work with the psychiatrist if he was going to take care of his students; and secondly, from the point of view of an administrator who is much concerned with the times in which we live, the problems we have, and some understanding, or groping for some understanding, as to how psychiatry fits into the solution of those problems. So I make bold to speak very briefly on the subject, "The Psychiatrist and the Dean -- Past, Present and Future."

It was not so many years ago that most men and women in education had never heard of a psychiatrist. Those were the days when the 'raison d'etre' of a college education was fairly clear in the mind of parent, professor, and student; when teachers were broadly trained and transmitted to their students, in answer to a natural sense of responsibility as teachers, not only subject matter but somehow a sense of understanding of the universe and man's place in the universe.

Old Dr. Peabody of Groton used to say that education was responsible for the physical, intellectual, and spiritual development of students; you will note that he did not refer to the emotions, but somehow there was not as great need in those days to

separate out the new component of "emotion;" an integrated approach to education gave the student an adequate integration within himself as he went through the developing years of college. And so in those days, Dean Briggs, broad of background, lover of men, clear in his concept of moral standards, and possessed of great common sense and understanding, did for his boys at Harvard what the general practitioner in medicine was doing for his patients.

With the advent of the scientific age, a plethora of new subjects in the curriculum, a vast increase in the occupations to which a college degree was an essential pass-key, with greatly increased numbers of students, and with all the other bigs -- big cities, big business, and big government, wherein the individual as an individual became lost in a card file -- students in college began to experience great unrest along with their elders in the adult world. Teachers had become specialists, and despite the possible inclinations of the individual professor, the system had impelled him to transmit to his students a feeling that his was only an intellectual responsibility to the student.

And now, alas, the conscientious successors to Dean Briggs and his generation began to have new problems on their hands, to seek outside the university for some straw which would enable them to save their students whom they loved and believed in as much as Dean Briggs ever loved and believed in his boys. And so the new Dean found the psychiatrist, the clinical psychologist with his aptitude and projective tests, the reading specialist who, incidentally, if he was any good, transmitted to his students a sense of wholeness, unity, and integration. By spending frantic hours with students, their parents, and these outside agencies, our new Dean found he could "save" many of his boys.

And so, he began to talk to his colleagues on the Faculty about bringing these specialists to the campus. Gradually, despite the feelings of the Faculty member that here was someone usurping part of his job, here was someone penetrating the privacy of individual students beyond the right of the educator so to do, these agencies moved to the campus, although clearly located on the fringe of the main stream of activity. Only a very few institutions have begun to learn how truly to integrate these new insights and disciplines into the main stream of the college program, but real progress is being made in some places.

At this point, may I narrow the scope of my remarks to a discussion of the Psychiatrist and the Dean at M.I.T., as my concept of a program at the present which is as near the frontier of progress as any comparable situation in the country that I know of.

Please don't misunderstand me, neither Dr. Farnsworth nor I believe it is perfect, and at the close of these remarks I should like to make a few observations on what it appears to me future action should be, but we both believe we have today a very satisfactory working relationship. Let me discuss briefly the present situation.

First of all, let me apologize for appearing to assign certain characteristics or virtues to myself. In describing the Dean in this situation I merely outline what my ideals and objectives are, whether or no I am successful in living up to them. What then must be the attitudes and characteristics of a Dean working parallel, in terms of organization, to the psychiatrist?

Incidentally, at M.I.T. our situations are definitely parallel. Dr. Farnsworth, as Director of the Medical Service is responsible to the President; and I as Dean of Students, am responsible to the President.

First, the Dean believes implicitly that education demands the integrated development of the student physically, intellectually, emotionally, spiritually, and socially, and that therefore, the Faculty being responsible for the educational program, the Faculty must take responsibility for the impact of the institution on the student in all these areas.

Secondly, he believes that students must necessarily be products of their environment and, consequently, their further development demands a knowledge and understanding of that environment.

Thirdly, he believes that the foundations of democracy and the Judao-Christian tradition lie in the uniqueness and sacredness of each individual as a son of God, and therefore education must revolve around concern for each individual as a whole person.

Fourthly, the Dean must believe implicitly in the basic desire of each individual to do what's right, regardless of what he may have done or be doing.

Fifthly, he must believe in his students and transmit to them a feeling of trust and love.

Sixth, he must have a clear sense of moral standards, values, and ideals which grow out of the ideals of the institution and the state and country in which it exists.

With these six basic beliefs, what, then, must be the Dean's attitude toward the psychiatrist and psychiatry? First,

because he believes man is of emotional parts, he understands that emotional disturbance can acutely influence or clearly explain a student's actions and attitudes. Therefore, he cannot, to quote Dr. Farnsworth, "look upon every variant from accepted social behavior as a challenge to his authority."

Secondly, he understands that emotional disturbance and consequent anti-social attitudes and actions very often arise out of inadequate satisfactions from the present environment, regardless of influences of the past environment. Therefore, in handling any situation, he is sufficiently permissive to weigh the aberration of the student against the faults of the environment which may well be causing even wider aberrations from the norm than the Dean knows. Incidentally, the psychiatrist, or he and his office, invariably know that these aberrations do exist. For the same reason the Dean is not tempted so easily to start on a witch hunt, but rather, perhaps, to start working, with the help of the psychiatrist, on the Faculty Committee on Student Environment.

Thirdly, he assumes that the good modern psychiatrist is, of course, completely permissive in his relations with individual students but handles the student, and, therefore, his recommendations to the Dean, on the basis that there are standards and that somehow the individual must face up to and conquer his problems within at least an outward acceptance of the standards of the community.

Fourth, the Dean must be sufficiently oriented to the facts of life and the psychiatrist's interpretation of the same, that he is no more easily shocked than the psychiatrist himself.

Fifthly, the Dean must have a relationship with the psychiatrist of sufficient mutual confidence that he can be given rather full, confidential information about a student and then, in fairness to student, family, psychiatrist, and institution, handle a given situation without revealing special knowledge.

What are the particular strengths in this situation? Because we can work very closely together and yet because we are parallel in responsibility, we can serve as a check on each other in relation to the welfare of the student or the institution. As the Dean must both be responsible to the rules and regulations of the school and to the parents -- or to put it another way, as the Dean can approach the individual student and the family as a layman interested in the whole man, he can often help the family or the student interpret the recommendation of the psychiatrist in relation to test scores, the opinion of the family, the Faculty,

the fraternity, student government, or the family doctor.

Are there any weaknesses in this very modern setup and have we yet found the proper role for psychiatry in education? I believe Dr. Farnsworth and I both agree there are weaknesses and that we can still improve the role of psychiatry in education.

The weaknesses in the present situation, as I see them, are primarily three in number. First, psychiatry and psychiatric insights being almost entirely connected with the medical department, the psychiatrist becomes bogged down too often in taking care of individual patients, many of them our weakest citizens in relation to their present ability to profit from our program, and is, therefore, handicapped in being able to contribute his insights to the main stream of the educational process.

Secondly, because of the great student demand for psychiatric assistance, the department has become very large, with the consequent feeling arising too often in Faculty and Administrative minds -- and perhaps with some justification, I might add -- that psychiatry is too much in the saddle.

Thirdly, in relation to the running friendly argument which Dr. Farnsworth and I are constantly indulging in, namely, the permissiveness of the psychiatrist and the moral standards of society, the psychiatric insight being only in the medical department, where patient-doctor professional confidence exists, too often a bad moral situation, either for the individual or for the community, is allowed to drag on interminably contributing both to the detriment of the community and to the inefficiency of the psychiatrist in helping his patient to face reality.

What, then, is the direction of the next step? I think the answer lies in the importance of Faculties once more facing up to the fact that education is the development of the whole man and that, therefore, their responsibilities, both as teachers and as deliberative bodies forming educational policies, are towards the individual student recognized as unique and sacred as a son of God and possessed of physical, intellectual, emotional, spiritual, and social parts.

I therefore visualize that the next step lies in having men trained in medicine and psychiatry step out of their role as private physician and join hands with the philosopher and the clergyman, who likewise step out of their roles as professor of philosophy and minister -- all three forming a team which works intimately with the scientists and social scientists to find the intellectual answer to the integrated education of an integrated

individual who may be following any one of a hundred or more specialized interests in preparation for his career, but who must also be prepared for self-fulfillment and a role as contributing citizen to his society. Because of the size of our institutions and because of the many fields of knowledge now being studied, realistic student counseling systems must be set up. It is in this area that I see the psychiatrist, fortified with insights from his teammates in philosophy and religion, playing a vital role in education in the next few years. And as this is one, and done successfully, our medical departments can be reduced in size, and psychiatric attention for the individual assume a place comparable to medical attention for the individual. [Applause]

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Thank you, Dean Bowditch.

We have been most fortunate in having Dean Hunt of Swarthmore act as our pinchhitter for Bob Strozier. Dean Hunt has just completed a report for one of our National Foundations on the relationship of the Dean of Students to the psychiatrist.

DEAN EVERETT HUNT (Swarthmore College): I have recently written a manuscript on this subject to be submitted to a Foundation which has supported our program for the past three years. The program has been going for four years. I perhaps fortunately did not bring that manuscript along, not expecting to appear on this program. Therefore, I don't feel obligated to unload the whole load here. [Laughter]

I find myself in hearty agreement with what has been said this morning, and there is so much similarity between my report and what has been said that I think I can omit very much of it, perhaps making part of it rather factual on our procedures so that you may compare them with yours, or with your situation. In this report I did allow myself the luxury of a fairly short theological introduction.

There has been a good deal of discussion in these meetings of what are the opportunities of a dean, who is a dean, and how does he get to be that way. I would like to call your attention to the fact that the Dean by origin and tradition is an ecclesiastical official in a cathedral in the Church of England. The Bishop is oftentimes the head of it. He supposedly devotes himself purely to the spiritual concerns, and the dean is meant to maintain the fabric of the cathedral. He does the daily routine, handles the relationship of the cathedral to the community around it, sees that the services and the rituals are in working order, and it is hoped that he may be spiritually minded enough to preach the sermon occasionally when the Bishop is away. [Laughter]

So he has some of the spiritual coloration of the head of the church, and something of the executive capacity of a financial vice-president. It is oftentimes difficult to keep those two in perfect harmony. [Laughter]

I suspect that a good many college presidents have lost a good deal of the functions of the old Bishop, and the dean has in a good many ways ceased to be an ecclesiastical official, and yet he cannot divest himself, I think, of all of that. He is, in the eyes of the constituency of the college, the upholder of the traditional mores of the communities which send their students to the college, and, on a somewhat low and cynical level perhaps, he is at least expected to provide a certain cloak of respectability to the college to see that those official mores are publicly paid tribute to, and so far as he can to see that they are obeyed.

Now he finds himself suddenly collaborating -- almost suddenly -- with a man whose view of human nature is probably fundamentally naturalistic and the two have to learn to get along together and to be grateful for each other's help.

I want to echo again what was said about the cooperation with Dean Strozler, who unfortunately cannot be here, and say that in my experiences with Dr. Leon Saul, who is our psychiatrist, our personal relationships have been those of close and intimate friends and that I do not see very well how this relationship between the former ecclesiastic and the natural scientist can be very successful except on terms of friendship and mutual trust, and the kind of mutual esteem which can lead to intimate arguments on what used to be theological questions, and the ability to see the solution of our problems in terms which are acceptable to both; and I have a firm belief that that is perfectly possible.

In my report I tried to define the functions of a Dean, and I was not writing this for a convention of Deans, but for people who asked me, "What in the world does a Dean do?" For the purposes of that report I described three functions of the Dean which do not at all coincide perhaps with all of our individual arrangements, but which seemed to me to form a sort of fundamental unit. In performing these three functions it is very natural to see how a Dean can play God and thus maintain his ecclesiastical standing. [Laughter]

In the first place I went on to say that with us at least the office of the Dean is responsible for admissions -- maybe directly, or indirectly, or through a good many subordinates, or through a good many different offices -- but ultimately the admissions program is the responsibility of the Dean, and if

the behavior on the campus is such that the college constituency says the admissions committee has lost its head over scholarship and is admitting only intellectual neurotics, the Dean inevitably faces the responsibility for that. He cannot avoid that no matter how it is administered. So his office, in a way, determines who gets in.

After they get in, his office determines on what terms they stay in. That is, he punishes the wicked and he rewards the righteous. There is a whole system of punishments for which, however administered, the Dean must take the ultimate responsibility; and there is a whole system of rewards which the Dean does not always administer but for which he has, I think, ultimate responsibility. Even such things as election to Phi Beta Kappa, election to this or that or the other honor -- some of these honors, it seems to me, were evolved in days when we never thought about "What is the effect of bestowing an honor upon those who are not honored?" If you care to reflect on the bitterness with which students who are not Phi Beta Kappas protect themselves against the honor paid to those who are Phi Beta Kappas, you will see, I think, that there is a pretty serious psychological problem about the question, "Does the whole system of rewards of excellence really stimulate, or really hurt?" I cannot really answer that question, but I think the Dean's office cannot escape responsibility for it.

Then in the whole system of punishments I would say that all of these three processes -- admitting them, rewarding them, and punishing them -- while the Dean has ultimate responsibility, those processes have all become, and properly so, very greatly democratized, and in our admissions work we distribute that over a faculty committee that sees to it that standards are maintained, and it exerts a great influence on the process.

In punishing students there is a very great development of student government. We have referred most matters of discipline to committees of student government with a sort of preface that the ultimate responsibility for discipline rests with the administration, but that it delegates as much of it as can be responsibly accepted by the students, and with the understanding that, regretfully, if the student government does not discharge its functions and if, after repeated warnings, it disagrees too much with the administration, the administration will take over. We have not done that, but that possibility still remains.

This morning we have described, I think, something of the effect of the psychiatric point of view on an older view of punishment, and so we ask, "How does the psychiatric point of

view permeate the various student bodies that handle the discipline?"

I suppose in proportion as the psychiatrist exerts a greater and wider influence (educational influence), that influence on the student bodies will be greater.

In our college, I think, due to the work of our psychiatrists and their influence on the administrative officers, and the courses of psychology on the campus, that influence is very great. Only recently representatives of two of the student government bodies that handle discipline came and suggested to me that they thought there were certain categories of cases which they ought not to handle because they were best handled from the point of view of psychiatry and it was a little bit difficult to administer that in a fairly large committee with its attendant publicity.

I was rather surprised to have come from the students the suggestion that they would prefer not to handle cases of stealing, that several members of the committee had recently been reading some psychological material on the causes of stealing and they thought that could be handled best from the psychiatric point of view and should be handled by the Dean in consultation with the psychiatrists.

We now have a sort of understanding, when I have to call up cases of discipline, that I will consult first the chairmen of these two student bodies concerned, and will get their opinion of whether or not they would like to handle it as an issue of simple punishment for breaking a rule, or whether they would like to have it handled in light of the recommendation of the psychiatrist. A year or so ago, if we had tried to handle such cases that way there would have been an outcry that the administration was infringing upon the rights of the students; now they have very gladly volunteered the recommendation that this should be handled by the dean and the psychiatrist.

In our dormitory system for men we have a system of student proctors who are chosen primarily for their influence on the students. There are probably three or four psychology majors in that group of 25 students, and the rest of them are in all sorts of fields. Nobody has been chosen on there because he was a psychology major, and they have great debates in their meetings. The psychology majors insist that here is a great chance to practice their future major profession, and they would like to treat the boys in their wing as a psychiatrist would; but there is great distrust of that on the part of the other boys who say, "Let's not make this professional, let's use understanding

and let's don't mar the whole system by being amateur psychiatrists who might make many mistakes." I don't have the ultimate answers there; but I would say that through the influence of the psychiatrists and the courses in psychology this point of view is permeating the student body and I suppose, with some occasional mistakes of judgment, I think it has on the whole produced a very much greater area of understanding than we have ever had before.

Our two psychiatrists are conducting one-hour extra-curricular courses on emotional development and adjustment in small groups. When we started this we thought this might lighten the load of the psychiatrists on individual appointments. I think on the contrary it has increased the load by making people more eager to go and talk to the psychiatrists, and by increasing their confidence in him.

One word, perhaps, about financial arrangements and budgets. The psychiatrists are on a salary from the college, so that there is no thought that they are looking for patients. The college does charge a fee of \$5.00 per student for seeing the psychiatrist, and that is to protect him from too many merely curious and casual people who want to talk about themselves. I am not sure that that is wise, but it has operated fairly satisfactorily. Some people have said that more people who have \$5.00 easily accessible suffer from psychiatric troubles than those who have to earn their own money. [Laughter] I don't know whether that is true or not.

For that \$5.00 a person may see the psychiatrist from one to three times. If, after the third time, the psychiatrist feels that he is in need of longer treatment he refers him to some practitioner in the city and the financial responsibility becomes that of the family and the individual.

That has led us to feel that we ought to intensify our efforts toward group therapy, because it is so time consuming and it is so expensive that if we could achieve greater results than we have thus far in group therapy it would be a very great advantage to all the student body.

Now just one final word perhaps about the relation of the psychiatrist to public opinion. I think in one sense the Dean oftentimes has to "front" for the psychiatrist.

When we first talked about adding to the budget for medical services and we confronted an alumni committee of M.D.'s we found those M.D.'s very conservative about having psychiatrists on the staff. There was a very considerable amount of opposition

there and we had to do a great deal of explaining. When it went to the Board of Trustees the general reaction was, "When we were in college we didn't have troubles of that kind, and we didn't need that kind of aid," and this was a "weak and soft generation" and "Why should they get all of this kind of treatment?"

One of the trustees who is head of a large corporation, however, said that his corporation had been using psychiatrists with their workmen for the past fifteen years, and he was amazed and shocked to find that the college hadn't gotten to that point in its development. That was very helpful to us in supporting the program. [Laughter]

I am often asked whether or not students feel that they are benefitted by this, or whether they just get a little luxury talking about themselves, and whether they really need it.

I have formed a habit of talking to students who have been referred to the psychiatrist and I often say to them, "I am not going to ask you anything about the details of this, but ten years from now when I write you a letter asking you to give to the annual giving fund, and they say that you can give to whatever cause you want to mention, if I should mention the psychiatric budget, would you contribute?" The answer is practically a unanimous "Yes." So I think I can report to our public that the students are in favor of it.

One final aspect of public opinion. Whenever there is any kind of incident on the campus which results in a public comment on our morals and manners, there are always some people who say, "The psychiatrists are at the root of it. If it hadn't been for this widespread permissiveness of the psychiatrists, for this feeling of a student that if he goes to the Dean the Dean will treat him as an ecclesiastic, and if he goes to the psychiatrist, everything will be all right -- if it weren't for that, you wouldn't have this general lowering of moral standards."

One reply to that is that this lowering of moral standards is observable in many cases where there are no psychiatrists. [Laughter] But I do think it is necessary for the Dean to feel that he is something of a public representative and defender of a psychiatric program in the institution and to assert and, if possible, to prove that on the whole the emotional health of the students, the standards of work and even the standards of conduct are improved by the insight and understanding into the emotional life of students given by the psychiatrists. [Applause]

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Dean Hunt, we thank you very much.

I am sure that it was a grand job of pinchhitting that you did for Bob Strozler.

We are now going to take a short recess before we give the audience a chance to come at the panel. Please be back at a quarter of eleven. We shall recess until a quarter of eleven.

... Fifteen minute recess ...

CHAIRMAN WALTER: The meeting will please come to order. If you have a look at the way our panel is seated, you will find them seated in the Doctor-Dean team arrangement, with Dr. Wedge and Dean Hunt on my left, and Dr. Farnsworth and Dean Bowditch to my right.

Before we let you come at the panel, we are going to let the members within the teams ask questions of one another. Dr. Wedge, would you lead off. Do you have any questions you would like to put to the Dean?

DR. WEDGE: I do indeed. I had several things I wanted to take up, as a matter of fact, that I made notes on during the talks. One was on the question of permissiveness, which came up for a lot of kicking around in the discussion, particularly Dean Bowditch's remarks, that the Dean assumes that the psychiatrist is completely permissive in regard to the student.

I want to explain to Dean Bowditch something about this and that is that the psychiatrist above all people stands for principles of individual integrity, or should, and for social responsibility.

Now, where this permissiveness comes in is the matter of psychiatric method. It is not an attitude toward behavior, but a matter of method. If you are going to be helpful to people, you have to give them permission to talk, permission to talk about anything -- their innermost feelings, fantasies, thoughts, impulses -- but you do not have to give them permission to do things, and you certainly do not. But the permission to talk about themselves is very important.

Since the psychiatrist's interest in in solving the basis for a social activity -- we think that a social activity, by the way, is never individually, personally helpful -- since we are interested in solving the basis for it, we feel that we cannot do so if we, early in our interviews with students, take a condemning attitude toward any behavior they have engaged in. As soon as that happens the student stops talking, and as soon

as that happens we have lost contact with him. So our permissiveness is in our psychiatric method, not in our attitude toward the behavior.

I would say too that there is another aspect of this, that the psychiatrist, particularly in the universities and colleges, faces roughly two great types of problems. One of these which are particularly demonstrated in the younger students, the college entrants, the adolescents (the late adolescents and the perpetual adolescents), are those people who need control for themselves, in fact, need to learn to internalize control so they can control their social behavior, and who need to have set for them a definition of limits to behavior, both by the social setting they are in and also by the psychiatrist who they may see.

So this is a problem in guidance, and it represents actually the opposite of permissiveness. It represents the ability to set a limit on activity which goes across generally accepted or reasonable mores of society.

The other type of student that we see a good deal of, or the other type of problem, is that of inhibited students where the problem is precisely the opposite. What these people need to learn is to trust their own impulses. This is where permissiveness really comes in. Inhibited students do not act asocially generally. We need to teach them to be more able to trust their own impulses -- not only the sexual impulses but their competitive impulses which may from their inhibition cause failures in their school work, cause failures in their relation to their fellows and so forth.

I would like to turn to a couple of more comments I have to make. I hope this clears it up a little bit concerning Dean Hunt's remarks. The first one was that when he began to discuss the problem of stealing I thought he was going to put the responsibility entirely on the psychiatrist for straightening out people who steal, which I would not think is correct, and I just would like to emphasize what you finally got around to.

This is a responsibility which the psychiatrist has to share with the Dean and with the administration. In other words, you have to work on both sides of it so that the psychiatrist may make recommendations to the administration about dealing with the problem in addition to (if it is a treatable problem) taking the person for treatment.

Dean Hunt also expressed some doubt about whether

students should be charged a fee for psychiatric work. My impression is that students should always be charged a fee for psychiatric work, and this allows them to get treatment on a more dignified and more professional level, even if the fee is small. We have gone around Robin-Hood's barn to make it possible for us to charge students fees for this. The fees now go under the general funds of the university. We lose them; there is no gain to the psychiatric department, but we are finally able to charge them a modest fee, and it helps our work go along very much.

DEAN HUNT: For each interview?

DR. WEDGE: Yes, for each interview. It works out very nicely. Actually not the first -- we cover that under the student health coverage, but if we take anybody for treatment we charge them a regular fee, which is widely variable. It may be as low as \$1.00 an interview or something like that.

Also, I should like to warn you, Dean Hunt, about one of your later remarks about group psycho-therapy, which you think might be a saving. I am afraid you might have the same experience with group psycho-therapy as you had with the psychiatrist teaching courses, that it really does not save time. It may make treatment available to more students, and is actually a kind of treatment which is very, very helpful with adolescents. You know adolescents fight against authority from without, and against being pushed around, but they take standards from each other. That is, a group standard is generally evolved among adolescents and they treat, instead of their parents as the source of conscience, a group of their peers; and a psychiatrist working with a group can help them evolve the standards which are acceptable to them because they come from within their own group level, and which are still in the direction of maturity.

So, although group psycho-therapy certainly does not seem to save time -- it hasn't for us, and it hasn't at Minnesota where it has been tried a great deal -- it may be a very effective method of treatment particularly in the younger group of students.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Which one of the Deans wants to come back at Dr. Wedge first? Mr. Bowditch.

DEAN BOWDITCH: I would like to say just a word in answer to this whole subject of permissiveness versus standards. I am not sure that Dean Hunt didn't make very clear the basis of my deepest concern on this matter. As things work out between

Dr. Farnsworth and myself in the handling of an individual case, I am not particularly concerned.

As we discussed last evening, very often it is either he or myself that takes the initiative in being tough in the handling of an individual case. In other words, as you point out, the psychiatrist in handling his students, although he must let the student talk about anything and feel free to talk about anything, he is at the same time insisting that he meet certain standards.

I think the area, therefore, that expresses my gravest concern on this subject is in connection with what Dean Hunt calls "our ecclesiastic responsibility as a Dean." I am very much concerned about the problem we have of reinstituting in the colleges and in the country as a whole something really positive, in which we believe, a positive, moral, spiritual faith, if you will. When at the present time so many students feel that the one place they can go and talk over the problems of life with full reception is the medical department, or the psychiatrist, the thing that concerns me is that the psychiatrist therefore becomes the sole discipline, too often, which is guiding the student in his total interpretation of life.

I run into an increasing number of boys who appear to be going to the psychiatrist to be sure they may get some help, but not primarily because they couldn't exist without that help; but rather they are going to him for an understanding of life itself, and the student's place in life. There is the point at which I would like to see the clergymen and the philosopher brought in somehow to share this responsibility for the students.

DR. WEDGE: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Dr. Farnsworth, do you have any questions or remarks you would like to put to the panel?

DR. FARNSWORTH: My two comments are mainly remarks. I was interested in Dean Hunt's comment about the psychiatrist being blamed for the things that go wrong. There is an exact parallel with that in the treatment of the severely ill patient with an emotional disorder, who very frequently blames the hospital for the illness. "If I were not in a hospital, I would not be ill," neglecting the fact that the illness was the responsibility for getting into the hospital. We are accustomed to that in this setting.

It is interesting that that came from a medical group.

We are loath to say it, but we have to say it that the strongest hostility to psychiatry comes from among other groups in the medical profession -- the part of it that is not psychiatric; and there are many reasons for it.

The other comment I should like to make is in answer to a question which I got secondhand: "What about the desirability of permitting a student to open up, to speak, to a faculty member in a counseling situation? Isn't that risky to have the Professor of Economics taking the place of the psychiatrist?"

We don't for a moment propose that. What we want in a counseling situation is that the Professor of Economics, or of History or of Chemistry have a counseling relationship that is organized around the intellectual and friendly relationship between the two, and that this counseling relationship persist even while the doctor-patient relationship is going on. It is a continuing thing and is not in competition in any sense with the work that the psychiatrist is doing. It is not fair to maneuver a faculty member into a therapeutic situation. As a matter of fact, it is very dangerous, as some of you know from some of the tragedies that have occurred on some of our large university campuses in the last few years.

We know, without being able to prove it, that many of those tragedies were known in advance, potentially, and that persons knew it who discounted the dangers involved, and hence the tragedies which usually involve losing of life of students did occur.

I will pick up another one of my pet subjects, and that was the relationship between psychiatry and religion. We frequently are accused of being irreligious in the same way as we are accused of being amoral. My favorite statement in regard to that is that psychiatry and religion are neither in conflict nor in competition, that the psychiatrist makes use of the religious background of the individual in a very direct way, but not by taking sides. We have to remain useful to every conceivable variety of person who comes to us for help, and so we are neutral as regards what type of religion the individual may have, but not neutral regarding the individual having some kind of a personal belief or set of standards that is bigger than himself.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Dean Hunt, do you have anything?

DEAN HUNT: I would like to ask one question, if I may.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Surely.

DEAN HUNT: I suppose this would be a question to the psychiatrists, and it perhaps is related to the last remarks of Dr. Farnsworth, that the psychiatrists do favor a student having some standards outside himself. We have heard them say that they advise a student not to indulge in anti-social behavior, but to accept the standards of the society around him as a sort of common sense procedure which will make him happier, give him more relaxation, more freedom from tensions, and more peace of mind.

Yet, a great many students have told me fairly lately that the administration had no convictions on moral matters other than a conformity to the community, and they say, "Not only the psychiatrists teach us that the only standard is the standard of the community, which obviously changes rapidly in the generations and in the different periods, but almost all the social scientists have that same relativity; therefore," they say, "if we can do anything to change that standard we want to do so." And I would say a good many of the more rebellious ones have what I would call a martyr complex. They will freely offer themselves up as sacrifices to change the standards of the community.

It may be a rationalization of their own practice, but when we have to inflict punishment, and oftentimes with the complete approval of the psychiatrist, and say, "You just can't do that," they retort, "You're just a part of a vast mass hypocrisy. You don't really believe this is wrong; you're just conforming to the sentiments of the possible donors to the institution."

And I have not been able to find an answer to that. Perhaps the psychiatrist can convince such a person to show common sense and relax and follow the standards of the community. It has been my experience that that advice causes a good deal of bitterness and that it is very difficult to get it accepted. Are there any other standards than the standard of the community, which so many of them reject?

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Dr. Farnsworth.

DR. FARNSWORTH: The questions which Dean Hunt brings up have bothered me a great deal, and I do not know of any really good answer that will satisfy the student who has that particular point of view.

I remember last year we had a foreign student project in which we brought in eighty students from various countries scattered over the world, and one of them at the very first meeting criticized M.I.T. for exploiting its students because he said, "You have plenty of money, and yet you charge us \$800.00 a

year tuition. Therefore, you are exploiting the student." He had the same point of view as the one you are mentioning. He neglected to mention the fact that tuition was waived in his instance because he was a foreign student, but he was critical anyway.

Which leads me back to a comment made by Elton Mayo in his "Social Factors in an Industrial Society," I believe it is, in which he had studied fairly intently six labor agitators and found that as a group they were inclined toward crisis thinking -- every action has to be an emergency action, everything had to be dramatized. Their personal backgrounds were those of deprivation of love and affection and trust, inconsistency rather than consistency was the rule. So it has seemed to me that with our students who always twist every one of their actions around to some peculiar interpretation, such as that we are just trying to please the community in order to get more money, I think of them primarily as being rather unstable individuals and almost sick individuals. They merely mirror the sort of thing we see in our larger society, however, because we have a phenomena in this country in which we criticize first and think afterwards, and we have a large group of students who do exactly the same thing.

I remember on one occasion last year when the question of open house rules came up at a certain dormitory, and they held a mass meeting to which I was invited to come to be the sacrificial victim. [Laughter] For four hours we battled that question back and forth, with every conceivable argument that I could muster and all they could muster. After about three hours they began to weaken. I did, too, but I didn't let on. [Laughter] I had to, in a sense, project some of their ideas out into the future, namely, what is going to be your reaction if your children act like you want to act? Well, they obviously would disapprove, but that was a problem for the future.

Now the egocentric idea is the favored one. You see, I cannot give an answer to your question, except to say that as psychiatrists we look upon that kind of behavior, that kind of rationalization, that kind of pseudo-sophistication, that kind of false thinking as an indication of a fairly deep-seated social sickness.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Dr. Wedge, do you have another answer, or an additional answer, or variation?

DR. WEDGE: Just a short variation on this. I agree that some standards are relative. Good humanity is not very relative; it is almost an absolute. But I would like to tell

Dean Hunt how I think I would answer this question. It would be with a question.

The adolescent student tries to make the psychiatrist a person who tells him what to do, then he can fight with the psychiatrist, as he has fought with you when you "tried to exploit him" as he says, by putting a set of standards before him.

The technique a psychiatrist uses is to begin asking questions. The questions you ask go like this: "Why do you need to do this?" "What satisfaction do you get out of it?" "What problems does it lead you into?"

We make the student answer his own questions as much as possible, and at the same time, without putting any of our own ideas into it, can very often lead him into some insight, some understanding of what the heck he is doing.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Are there still other questions from members of the panel to other members? If not, then we have come to the reward which I am sure this audience has earned. You have been an excellent group of listeners, and now you are going to have your chance to come back at the panel, and needle it all you care to. May I remind you that when you have a question, you please stand, give your name and the name of your institution. So now we are off, and who wants to ask the panel the first question?

DEAN BERNARD L. HYINK (University of Southern Calif.): I would appreciate any comments which any member of the panel would like to make with regard to the methods which they employ to overcome the reluctance that students often have to consult with a psychiatrist, resistance which we often experience in that particular occasion.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: How does the psychiatrist overcome the resistance from the student in wanting to see him? Dr. Farnsworth.

DR. FARNSWORTH: First, we do not want to see any student who does not want to see us, unless it is someone who has been referred because of a disciplinary problem or something of that sort.

Secondly, we try to consult with the faculty member, or with the Dean and show him, if he is not already convinced of it, that the student has everything to gain and nothing to lose. We let the student know that psychiatric record is not made a part

of his medical record and that no one need know about it; that a prospective employer may not know about it.

Third, at the M.I.T. we publish from time to time small articles in the student papers explaining why the psychiatric service is in existence, what the philosophy is, explain the private nature of the relationship, and that has been quite fruitful in causing disturbed persons to come in. If a suggestion is made to a student who needs help that he might go to the psychiatrist, then we think it is well just to wait for a while until the environmental pressures build up and he then conceives that it is his idea that he wants to come, which he very frequently does

The pressures are all those of invitation, of pointing out opportunity, and not those of making him come, so to speak.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Next question.

DEAN MARC JACK SMITH (University of Redlands): I have two or three things I would like to ask about, but I do not want to waste the time of several people here. I would just like to ask two, and then go on to a third one which I relay.

Does anybody in this group have any sort of pamphlet or written material, distributed to faculty members, suggesting to them the kind of cases which should be referred to a psychiatrist? In other words, methods by which faculty members are inculcated with ideas of what cases should be referred. If so, I would like to see those.

Secondly, I was interested in the comment that students in certain cases here were reacting against the responsibilities of guidance and urging that they be handed over to psychiatrists. This may be due, of course, either to reverence of the new god of psychiatry, but if anybody has any reactions on whether this is a part of a trend of students to wash their hands of certain responsibilities which they do not want I would be interested in that comment after this thing.

The question I really wanted to ask is, how about the relations between the psychiatrist, the speech therapist and the psychologist -- some of the psychologists in some of these universities? I would like to comment on that, please.

In other words, do you have trouble with these people stealing your students, or do you have trouble with telling them what students to refer to you, and what students to take to the

speech therapist, or what cases do the psychologist or teachers of psychology themselves handle rather than turning them over to the psychiatrist.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Jack Smith has three questions. The first one is for information in pamphlet form.

DEAN SMITH: Those first two, sir, people can see me afterwards. I don't want to take the time of the group. The last one is the relationship between the psychiatrist and other officials who are in somewhat the same job, whose jobs link upon psychiatry.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: How about that relationship, Dr. Wedge?

DR. WEDGE: We like to believe that all of these disciplines can and should cooperate all the way through. The relationship on our campus is one of communication, understanding of our respective roles, and cooperation with some degree of referral back and forth between ourselves and the psychologists who do therapy. At times this becomes rather difficult.

I will tell you a little bit about the special situation at the University of Chicago where Dr. Carl Rogers has an extensive counseling center. We don't compete for students at all, and Dr. Rogers and I get along exceedingly well personally, I might say. However, this has raised problems in this way, that in the inception of the Rogerian type of counseling, Dr. Rogers had profound methodological differences from the psychiatrists and they lay in this area, that they worked out diagnosis without an evaluation of the problem that they were facing -- that is being changed, incidentally, I understand in Dr. Rogers' setup -- and they treated with a single technique anything which came their way. As a psychiatrist I could not agree with this, nor could my psychiatric colleagues, and the consequence of it has been that in relation to the counseling center -- although not with some of the other psychologists that we have not communicated or been able to coordinate our programs as we should have liked. This is something of a historical problem which is being worked out and will be worked out over the next several years, and I think it is somewhat unique to the University of Chicago campus.

What I would like to emphasize for you though is that neither of us are disturbed about it. We are quite capable, Dr. Rogers and his group and myself and my group, of feeling that we both offer some things really valid, and that we are not in a competitive situation with each other. So there is no question of "stealing" students. Actually a good many of my people I am sure go up in the Counseling Center, and it is true that a good many of Dr. Rogers' clients, for one reason or another, come to

see me, but we do consult with Dr. Rogers and his counselors in problems that they get into in their counseling situations, and we have come closer and closer together as the years go by, and expect in future years to have a thorough integration of these services.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Next question, please.

DEAN JACK HOLLAND (University of Texas): I would like to expand Berney Hyink's question to the Deans. In making referrals, we are reluctant to require that one of our students go to the psychiatrist, but rather we try to sell him on the idea that he would like to go so that his visit might be more voluntary and so that the psychiatrist will not have the job of breaking down his reluctance.

I would like to ask the Deans, then, by what techniques do you sell the idea to the student of going to the psychiatrist?

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Dean Bowditch.

DEAN BOWDITCH: I follow two procedures in that kind of a situation. In the first place, if in my first interview with the student I am convinced that he does need psychiatric help, and I find him very resistant to it, I merely go as far as I can in that particular interview in indicating to him, (1) I understand what his problem is. I try to transmit to him a feeling that I understand it, and I try in any way that I can to begin to break down his resistance.

Then, if he is not ready to go to the psychiatrist at that point, I invite him back to see me, and I may see him two, three or four times myself, and hope that at the end of that time he is then ready to go to the psychiatrist. If that does not work, or maybe in conjunction with that program I am apt between let's say his second and third visit to call Dana and explain to him the type of situation and get advice from him as to the attitude that I assume towards the student in order to probably hasten his own willingness to go and see the doctor.

As Dr. Farnsworth indicated, that would appear to be in somehow highlighting for him, or bringing more quickly to bear the pressures of the community so that he really feels he has a problem which he must solve.

DR. CARL W. KNOX (Northern Illinois State Teachers College): Does the panel have any reaction to the use of the psychiatric services on a part time basis by smaller schools and colleges?

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Part time psychiatric services for smaller schools on a part time basis -- do you want to take that, Dr. Wedge?

DR. WEDGE: I think Dana is the man for that.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Dr. Farnsworth.

DR. FARNSWORTH: It is quite obvious that there are not enough psychiatrists to meet the needs in this field. One might ask the question, "Why are you interested in cultivating this field if you don't have anybody to take the appointments that may be offered?" The reason for it is that the problem is there, and it is up to us to approach it from the standpoint of the psychiatrists and the educators to try to get it solved in some way or another.

So far as the smaller institution is concerned, they do not have the need for a full time psychiatrist, nor do most of them have the budget to pay a full time psychiatrist. Therefore, various combinations have to be worked out. One of them is the use of a member of the Medical Department who has training in internal medicine, who has a natural leaning in the direction of psychiatry, and who subjects himself to in-service training, if you like, in consultation with a psychiatrist who may be able to see him, or to assess a situation only every two or three weeks. As a matter of fact, that is the way I got started in this field, by that very method, having started in internal medicine.

Another combination is for the psychology department and a consulting psychiatrist to cooperate in trying to meet the emotional needs of the students and to act as consultants for the faculty counselors, not on the basis of one group being superior to the other, but on the basis of complete cooperation.

The hint from one of the questions that you asked earlier is that psychologists and psychologists don't get along too well. That is unfortunately true in some instances. There is no insuperable block to that, and we find, as we get into the subject more and more, that we can and do and should cooperate on the basis of complete equality, knowing however that the psychologist has one set of skills, the psychiatrist has another, and that they should be complementary.

Another combination is for the psychiatrist to come, say, one day a week or one day every second week and discuss the problems that are encountered with the Dean and other administrative officers and see a few of the more disturbed patients.

There are several combinations of that sort, but we would say that in general a school which has fewer than 1,000 students probably cannot support a full time psychiatrist.

I left out one other combination, namely, having a psychiatrist half time and allowing him to do private practice in the community another half time. One that I have argued for many times but have not seen in action very many places is that two schools fairly close together divide a psychiatrist's time so that he can get accustomed to the problems of both schools.

To summarize, we do think that a little consultation may and should be better than none.

DEAN THEO. ZILLMAN (University of Wisconsin): I would like to pose a very practical case, if I may, and get Dr. Farnsworth and Dr. Wedge to tell the way it is handled at their respective institutions.

Let's say a boy comes in to me because he has been arrested by our Madison Police for drunkenness. In the course of our conversation I peg him as a clearly, deeply emotional individual. I may have some kind of insight into what is bothering him; maybe I haven't. I succeed in convincing him that our psychiatrist can be of assistance to him.

Now then, he goes over and keeps his appointment with the psychiatrist and the psychiatrist discovers that he is a homosexual, that he is one of those, like Socrates, who corrupts the youth on our campus, and yet he has come there to seek assistance with his problem under the cloak of secrecy, professional guidance and so on, of which you are very jealous.

Now, when you have discovered this, what and how do you people react, and do you talk it over with your respective Dean, and disclose to him what you admit will slow down the efficacy of your program on the campus, if it is known that such disclosures get to places where they hurt a student, because the university may want to take the procedure of asking him to leave school. So I would like to have that answered for me, if you please.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Dean Zillman's case was very clearly stated. It was touched upon by Dr. Farnsworth in his address and I will call on Dr. Farnsworth to elaborate.

DR. FARNSWORTH: I have had such situations and will have more. I take the attitude to the patient that you have violated the customs of the community. You are responsible to

them. You will have to settle your affair with the police force as best you can. Your behavior has also come to the attention of the administration, specifically of the Dean. That is a problem. You and I may talk it over. I will be of help to you in any way possible, but I will not be a means of getting you out of the consequences of your own acts.

Now, if the homo-sexual element has not been made public and no one knows of that, then I will not make it public. I will then try to treat the individual as a sick person, gradually letting him know however that if he offends the privacy of any other individual and that individual then makes a complaint that the disciplinary measures will be taken.

It is sometimes very difficult to follow that line that I mentioned. As a matter of fact, it is practically always difficult, but I think that it can be done in such a way that the patient will respect your integrity. You in turn can respect his difficulties. It is a kind of dichotomy, two ways of looking at it, in which you as the psychiatrist help him meet the problems from a personal point of view, but he has to bear the consequences and cannot lean on the psychiatrist to get him out of his difficulties.

I do not think there is any inconsistency in that point of view. I do not think of the homo-sexual patient as one who goes around corrupting others --if the atmosphere on the campus is a healthy one. I think of him as being quite a nuisance to others and of being an exciter of anxiety in other persons who are struggling with their own latent homo-sexual conflicts; but I do not subscribe to the idea that having such a person on the campus under treatment is going to do him any harm, or the campus any harm, as long as he knows that he has to maintain his own personal integrity in that field just the same as the other students have to maintain their heterosexual integrity.

SECRETARY TURNER: Can we take this hypothetical case just one step further, and say that you have discovered that this boy has this additional trouble, and Dean Zillman tells you, well in addition he doesn't know this, but he does know that this boy is in the College of Education, heading for teacher-training and planning to be a teacher. Now, knowing that when the student graduates that his diploma will probably be part of his certification for teacher training, what is the institution's obligation to say that this man may not go ahead and finish up that course for teacher training because it is too big a gamble?

It has happened in the past, and we have been burned on

it. It is a very practical and serious problem with us right now. Do I make my point clear?

DR. FARNSWORTH: Very clear. [Laughter]

I think the institution has a duty not to turn out physicians who are going to do harm, teachers who are going to do harm to others. I think that the psychiatrist is in the middle of a practically insolvable dilemma, and that he is going to have to squirm a good deal about it, but by and large he will have to help the individual himself see that going into teaching, particularly if it is a boy and he is going into a boy's school, that that is not going to further his own well being in the long run, and to try to dissuade him from going into an area that will increase the amount of anxiety which he already has.

Now, if the psychiatrist knows that a certain person is an out and out overt homo-sexual, but he has kept his behavior under excellent control, there has been real progress in his emotional development in the course of the few months or the year, whatever it is he has been under treatment, I would be very uncomfortable to go to the faculty, or whatever representative had to do with approving degrees and say, "I have to report to you that this man in the past has indulged in homosexual behavior and therefore should not have his degree." I would not do it. If I did do it, then I would start a series of events in motion which would harm every last one of us.

In the first place, it is reasonably certain I believe that more than half of any given group has had homo-sexual experiences of one kind or another. That does not mean that they are homosexuals. So, if I may squirm delicately off this spot [laughter], I would say that the psychiatrist must do his best toward the patient and at the same time keep in mind that he has an equal responsibility toward society, but that when he is square in the middle of the dilemma, then favor the individual if the individual is making favorable progress in the normal direction.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Dr. Wedge has a point on that.

DR. WEDGE: I would like to squirm indelicately on the spot that Dr. Farnsworth has just vacated and mention just a further bit of activity that the psychiatrist may engage in in this particular problem, in the real dilemma that Dr. Farnsworth describes.

People who have problems like this are sick. Not only that, they know they are sick. They are never comfortable with

them, just never. They may be defensive about it and hide it, but they are never happy about it.

We have been able in our work, over and over again, to help these people discover motivation for doing something about it. Very often doing something about it has involved being out of the university community for a greater or lesser length of time. We have no hesitation at all about using this motivation to help the person leave the campus community, not under a cloud and not with any report to the Dean of Students, who I merely tell, "I am recommending that a medical leave of absence for this student be given." Incidentally, that goes on his record, and he is not readmitted until he sees us again and has demonstrated to us that he has done something about it.

An amazing number of students in this situation, whether they have been caught by the police or whether they come to us without any academic pressure whatsoever, have been able to decide that this is something which they had better do something about, to leave the campus and do something about it and quite a few of them have returned with the problem solved or under control, and they have been much better citizens.

DR. ZILLMAN: Suppose he won't go?

DR. WEDGE: We try to help them discover within themselves his motivation. In that instance, of course, you would meet with immediate resistance to such an idea. We attempt to make a relationship with a person of such solidity and of such respect so that we can really begin to operate on down-to-earth terms with him. Then we can begin to be more frank with him about what we think about it, without being in the position of forcing him in any way; but by the strength of our relationship and his respect for our judgment which he has learned through the relationship, he becomes able to make use of our help.

I am sure that there are cases where we cannot be helpful. In that case we simply have to wait until the student bumps his nose against the hard wall of social reality from which we cannot defend him, and then it is an administrative problem.

I hate to have that happen. It happens seldom, but it occasionally will.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Dr. Farnsworth has another word.

DR. FARNSWORTH: I just want to complicate this a little bit more. What does the psychiatrist do when a student

comes and relates mutual homo-sexual activity with faculty members [laughter], and the student does not register a formal complaint? It is a confidential relationship. The colleague is known to you individually, if it is a small school. What do you do about it?

Well, the answer is you do nothing about it, until, or unless some student makes a complaint. Then one moves in. But that happens and if the psychiatrist goes on a witch hunt himself he may do an innocent person a lot of harm. We would prefer that an individual be considered as having integrity until proved otherwise, in contrast with some of the prevailing customs that seem to be gaining strength in this country.

This is a touchy one, but you have to keep very strongly in mind the rights of the individual, and do not start around making accusations without having somebody to back it up.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Are there other questions in this area of the sex deviate? If not, we will drop it and go on to another question.

DEAN RICHARD L. BALCH (Stanford University): Let's turn the Dr. Farnsworth question around. What if the student comes to the Dean with a statement that he has had homo-sexual activity with a faculty member. What spot are we in?

CHAIRMAN WALTER: What happens then?

DR. FARNSWORTH: If the student comes to the dean to report that, then it is the dean's headache and he is in a position to call the faculty member in and say, in effect, "Here's what is reported." Then it becomes a matter in which we all get embroiled sooner or later, but a student who is disturbed enough to come and make an official report almost always has some real facts to back up his statement. That has happened lots of times.

DEAN BALCH: I think that Dean Hunt has a partial answer here that should be brought into the picture. First of all, he stated that he had a close personal relationship with the psychiatrist at Swarthmore. I think that there is a very definite problem here that comes into the picture. I think it is highlighted by the Doctor's last statement that the Dean has a great deal of help to offer in a controlled situation where such an occasion arises. There is a great deal of advice that can come from the doctor, but it cannot be isolated from the psychiatrist himself. I know it is difficult for you to share the white coat, but it can be done.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Do you want to answer that, Dr. Wedge?

DR. WEDGE: I do not think it needs any other answer.

DEAN ARNO J. HAACK (Washington University): On the point on which you have just been, let's assume now that our office is familiar with the problem, that we are inclined to take a calculated risk attitude toward it. We do not know enough about it to want to be the sole arbiter of the individual's destiny -- discipline, homosexuality, etc. We would really like to know what the chances are of therapy being sufficiently beneficial to bring the kid within the range of calculated risk.

Now, how do we communicate at that point? How do we get professional judgment back into that decision? You see my point?

DR. FARNSWORTH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: I think both of these Doctors have answers to that question.

DR. FARNSWORTH: The percentage of success that is expected is not very high. I would just make an offhand estimate that one can help probably half of them. I would not want to say that one could not help the other half, but I would feel fortunate if I could accelerate the heterosexual development of half of the group.

I think of two particular individuals who by their own admission had overt homosexual relations over which they were very much distressed, and after a year's therapy had rapid success and married and now have families, and they think, and the wives think that they are getting along all right, and we'll have to say that that is helpful.

Now, I think it is perfectly possible that once the Dean knows that a given situation is in existence on a campus, then he and the psychiatrist are pretty free to communicate, you see, if each of them is discreet and does not publicize his views, and each of them takes the attitude favorable to the individual, namely that he is a sick person. Then I think there really is very little difference between the plight of the Dean and of the psychiatrist, and that the white coat can be shared, to use your phrase, under those circumstances.

What we strongly object to is the individual who comes for help and then the psychiatrist runs somewhere and makes it a

disciplinary problem, when no one else knew anything about it.

Does that get at your question?

DEAN HAACK: Yes.

DR. FARNSWORTH: I would like to mention one other thing personally, about this new god psychiatry. [Laughter] That always gets a little rise out of us. [Laughter] We are sensitive to the fact that psychiatry has been over-sold, and psychiatry is portrayed by the movies and by various other social agencies as working miracles,,and psychiatrists do not work miracles. It has even gone so far sometimes that the "New Yorker" publishes cartoons of the psychiatrist telling the patient, there is nothing wrong with you, your trouble is all in your body. [Laughter]

I appreciate what you say, that if we give the impression that psychiatry is some new movement designed to save the world, it just isn't so, and is a function of our ineptness in public relations, and not what we really feel that psychiatry has to offer.

SECRETARY TURNER: Dr. Farnsworth, may I raise one other question on the same point.

Have you given us then, as a summary, that where the case comes to you that you feel that the confidence is there, and you are not particularly expected to divulge it to anyone; but where we refer it to you, we have the right to come back and say, "What do you think of the situation, in our terms, in language we can understand?" Is that a conclusion at this stage?

DR. FARNSWORTH: That is absolutely my opinion.

DR. WEDGE: That is correct, and we do it very often with the disciplinary committee, not only giving a decision about the chances of cure and so forth, that Dean Haack is interested in, but also what kind of management by the administration will be most helpful to the student's chances. It may be that the most constructive action in our opinion is to put the student out of the university by disciplinary action, which finally may bring the student smack up against the fact that this just does not go.

SECRETARY TURNER: But there is the difference in the communication where the student voluntarily comes to you, you do not have the obligation; where we refer the student to you, we have a reasonable right to expect something in return.

DR. WEDGE: Right. The first thing we tell such students who come to us is, "Pal, we are going to talk to the Dean of Students as soon as we get through." We also tell them, "Anything which you tell us which is of a personal nature is between you and us. We only give the Dean of Students an opinion."

CHAIRMAN WALTER: We have time for one more question. Dean Carlson.

DEAN HARRY G. CARLSON (University of Colorado): I would like to ask, what can we do in a preventive way from developing this spread of homosexuality on the campuses?

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Dr. Wedge. [Laughter]

DR. WEDGE: Homosexuality is a problem that is determined before the student comes to the campus. I will tell you what we do.

I mentioned when I talked with you that I have given some discussions on sexual adjustment in the dormitory system. In the course of this I have told the students generally this sort of thing when the problem of homosexuality has come up. I say, "If you are a homosexual, you know it. If you aren't, and are just a little worried about it, you needn't because you are not one."

This results in two things. One is a relief of anxiety about homosexuality among the people who have some questions about it, as men living together in dormitories always will. The other is that the people who do know it, who are homosexuals, act on our attendant suggestion which is that if you are a homosexual and know it, and don't like it very much, there are possibilities for doing something about, and you had better see a psychiatrist, and they come to us.

Very often we are able to help them. You know, homosexuality is not a single psychological problem at all. It covers multiple sins. There are a thousand and one motivations for it. Some of them practically are remediable. Some of them are easily approached. That is about all the University can do about it because the problem is made before the students get there.

We cannot avoid admitting homosexuals to the university entirely because we do not know about them, and it is a problem that we will have with us probably always, as long as society and civilization raises the problems that it does and people are what

they are. Nevertheless, it can be minimized as a problem, and I do not consider it as a spreading problem. There are, I guess, no adequate statistics on that, but so far as I can gather from many discussions, it is about the same now as it ever was, except for perhaps a little more self-consciousness about it.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Audience, would you like to stay on another ten minutes?

... Cries of "Yes" ...

CHAIRMAN WALTER: All right, we will extend it for another ten minutes. Now Dr. Farnsworth would like to reply, then I would like to recognize Dean Baldwin.

... Remarks off the record ...

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Dean Baldwin of Cornell.

DEAN FRANK C. BALDWIN (Cornell University): I had just one question. In this line of communication, isn't there a possibility that we may be working at cross purposes with the psychiatrist if we haven't some way of knowing which patients he is working with and which we are? Does anyone have any suggestions?

We have a system at Cornell to check as to which students with whom you are working and which ones we are.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Would you like to check us in on how Cornell does it? Give us your procedure very briefly.

DEAN BALDWIN: Our procedure is that if we are working with the students, we have a system of knowing who he is, by a card system to which we can both refer. It is confidential, obviously. I wondered if any other system was set up that we might make some use of.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Do you have any other system?

DR. WEDGE: We never tell the Dean of Students at our University when we take a new student patient on. He doesn't know who we see. Sometimes we tell him how many we see, but that is about all.

However, the students who go to the Dean of Students with troubles of one kind or another, who get embroiled in troubles, are usually very quick to tell him, "I am beginning to

take up this problem with the psychiatrist."

Also our Dean of Students and his staff are very perceptive and they know that certain people are likely to be seeing the psychiatrist. They have no hesitation about picking up the phone and saying, "Wedge, do you know this person?" We may say, "Yes, we do," and the Dean will say, "Well I'm having to see him about a certain problem. May I ask him if I can discuss this with you?" The Dean asks the student. The student is in a position where he can hardly say no, for the most part for one thing, and usually they have enough confidence in us so they do not need to anyhow, and we are able to talk business. I do not think many fall between. I think that our communication is very good.

But until the students who are in treatment become problems to the Dean, which is as rare as we can make it, we do not think that we should communicate it.

DEAN MARSHALL J. JOX (Valparaiso College): I think this question pertains to our discussion. I should like to ask the panel what devices and techniques they may have worked out to resist perhaps the community pressure or parental pressure, or some other pressure to have some action taken "when a disciplinary problem is involved." For example, if the Dean thinks that it might be best for a boy to stay in school, to continue his remedial program, but the person or persons who reported it say, "How soon are you going to kick this guy out?" what could you do under those circumstances?

CHAIRMAN WALTER: How could the psychiatrist help in keeping on a student who needs remedial help, where that help has been begun, but because of the academic situation he may be forced out? Is that right?

DEAN JOX: Right -- public pressure or community pressure.

DR. FARNSWORTH: I call in whoever seems to be the chief agitator and discuss it with him. So far I have always been able to convince him of the logic of whatever action we have had -- not with great conviction on his part in every instance, but with sufficient to handle the problem.

If we have a large number of people, or an institution of one kind or another putting pressure on us, then we may have to compromise, as in a little fracas we had one time, in which M.I.T. students decided to put some perma-cord in the Harvard stadium, and exploded the letters M.I.T. Well they got caught.

In order to placate the Harvard officials, we had to give greater disciplinary measures than were indicated. But it was a choice between having a big fuss in the papers or letting the students take the rap a little more than they should.

We didn't do it in such a way as to disregard the rights of the students, but we brought them in on the decision themselves along with the complainants from Harvard and arrived at a conclusion which was apparently reasonably satisfactory to all the injured parties.

I think singling out the most vocal objector and dealing with him is the best technique that I have found.

DEAN BOWDITCH: I would like to say just one more word to what I think is implied in that question. It seems to me it underlines the importance that Dr. Farnsworth and I feel in having our two jobs parallel. In other words, we work very closely together, but it seems to me in this case we may go through the process that Dr. Farnsworth describes, but it ultimately is the Dean's responsibility in this case to decide whether the community is going to be favored over the individual. If he decides on behalf of the community or community pressure, he still can join the psychiatrist's point of view in his handling of the student after the action has been taken.

DR. FARNSWORTH: I should explain that I lapsed out of my usual role, when I spoke of calling in the person. I was thinking of last year when I was acting in his capacity. I do not as a psychiatrist. Excuse me.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: I suppose if Dean Bender happened to be here we should have heard from him too on that question.

The last question.

DEAN FRANK PISKOR (Syracuse University): What responsibility does the institution undertake to educate the various constituents in the community -- the press, the police station, and so forth -- to this new permissive approach? [Laughter]

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Do you have the question, Dr. Wedge?

DR. WEDGE: As already said, it isn't too permissive. It isn't too new either. We have had at the University of Chicago the feeling that we needed to educate no one about this. The fact is that the psychiatrist is only an adjunct to the Dean's

office where disciplinary problems come up. The Dean's office does not have to justify very often disciplinary action.

Now individually the police and such people have been exceedingly helpful and cooperative with us. Newspapers, fortunately, I think do not know of or choose to ignore the existence of our services. I think the university will be seen by the public by the deeds of its students and the deeds of its administration, and not by what kind of services they have, or what kind of attitude they are supposed to have. I am not very adequate at this, but that is the best I can do.

SECRETARY TURNER: It is the little town versus the metropolitan area.

DR. WEDGE: Dean Turner suggests it is the little town versus the college, where much more interpretation of the activity of the university is necessary --

SECRETARY TURNER: That is right.

DR. WEDGE: -- to the public, and while I am not very familiar with this, all I can say about it is that as many responsible members of the public are entitled to know about the basis for decisions should be left in on it.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: We have one minute for Dr. Farnsworth.

DR. FARNSWORTH: I had several years with a college of 800, and the question of town relationships, it seemed to me, could be solved most easily because of the fact that I belonged to the Rotary Club, that I was a good friend of the Chief of Police, I knew everybody in town, and consequently after a while they would say, "Well, if So-and-So is in charge, he will do what he thinks is the proper thing to do under the circumstances."

In other words, it is a public relations job in which a great deal depends on whether they have any confidence in the integrity of the doctor or not.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: I know that we are in agreement that we have had very unusual good fortune in having our guest members of the panel and in having our two Deans. I am sure that we owe them a big hand. (Prolonged applause)

The meeting is now adjourned.

... The Conference recessed at twelve-ten o'clock ...

THURSDAY LUNCHEON SESSION

April 3, 1952

The Conference reconvened at one-five o'clock, Dean H. E. Stone, University of California, presiding.

CHAIRMAN STONE: I suggest that having finished with your food you turn your chairs so as to be in a more receptive position; also the brethren in the far corner, we will allow you to move your chairs down this way, if you wish to do so.

One of the privileges of serving as chairman on an occasion of this kind is that of requiring every other man who sits at the head table to get up on his feet and at least take a bow, and so pay for this great privilege of sitting at the head table.

The first one I would like to call on to get up and take a bow probably would enjoy standing up, because I understand he has been sitting very recently for thirteen and a half hours in Albuquerque air terminal -- our own Vice-President, Bob Strozier. [Applause as he arose]

I cannot let this occasion go without, on behalf of the Association, again expressing our real appreciation to that panel that gave us such a wonderful program this morning, so I want to present to you, or require them to get up and stretch a bit, the members of that panel. Dr. Farnsworth. [Applause as he arose] Dean Hunt. [Applause as he arose] Dr. Wedge. [Applause as he arose] Dean Bowditch. [Applause as he arose]

It is an unusual pleasure for me also to introduce Dr. Paul Pitman, President of Idaho College, who is an old colleague of ours in the Bay area. Dr. Pitman. [Applause as he arose]

These other two birds, the farthest to my right, certainly need no introduction, but let me require them to also stand up, because I think it would be good for them. George Davis of Purdue. [Applause as he arose] Erich Walter of Michigan. [Applause as he arose] Not the least of those who put on such a good panel this morning, Erich.

One of the nicest things, I think, about our annual meetings is this particular assembly for the President's address, this assembly when our President talks to us frankly, directly, usually very informally, but always from his heart. Our President this year insists that he is not a technician, that he is not a psychologist, not even a psychiatrist, [laughter] not even

a Dean. He likes to say that he got his training for this business in which we are all engaged through the seat of his pants, to use his words.

Now, those of us who know Blair best are inclined to think that other parts of his anatomy have been involved in this process. [Laughter] On two of those, I would suggest first the head. It takes a good head to master the Social Sciences, and particularly Political Science to the point where you can become a successful college instructor in that field, where you will be in demand as a consultant with governmental agencies, and even become an author in the field of public utilities. It takes a good head certainly, and a good brain also to avoid the pitfalls of an Assistant Deanship, a Vice-Presidency, and we hope also the Presidency, which he now occupies.

Those of us, however, who know Blair best are inclined to think that a lot of his preparation for the distinguished leadership he has given us in the field of education has come very largely through the heart. We will accept that he is not primarily a technician, but we will insist that he is and has been an idealist, a philosopher, if you please, a dreamer in the best sense of that term, one who has sought to see himself and to help us to see the worthwhile goals that are ahead and the objectives of this day-to-day contact that we have with the boys on our separate campuses.

That very attitude and trait of our President certainly is witnessed by the very topic of our Conference this year.

Now you would not expect me as a Californian to allow an occasion such as this to go by without saying a few words on behalf of my great state. [Laughter] So I was very happy that our President recently made an extended journey to the state of California -- and, confidentially, he fell in love with that great state of ours [laughter] and particularly with its redwoods. Now having in mind this trip of Blair's, his love of the redwoods, his idealism, and the very theme of this Conference, I brought along with me a little poem which I propose to read at this time, a poem, interestingly enough, appearing in the monthly magazine on our campus, called the "California Engineer," edited and published by students without any faculty censorship whatever. I think it is significant also that the poem was written by an engineer -- the engineer who designed and who built the Golden Gate bridge. The poem is entitled:

THE REDWOODS

Here, Son, by the Creator's hand,
In Sierra's Range, the redwoods stand.
No other clime is honored so,
No other lands their glory know.

The greatest of earth's living forms,
Tall conquerors that laugh at storms.
Their challenge still unanswered rings
Through fifty centuries of kings.

The nations that with them were young,
Rich empires with their forts far-flung,
Lie buried now, their splendor gone.
But these proud monarchs still live on.

So shall they live when ends our day,
When our crude citadels decay.
For brief the years allotted man,
But infinite perennials' span.

This is their temple, vaulted high,
And here we pass with reverent eye,
With silent tongue, and awe-struck soul,
For here we sense life's proper goal.

To be like these, straight, true and fine,
To make our world like theirs, a shrine.

Gentlemen, the President of Denison University, our own
President, Dr. A. Blair Knapp. [Applause]

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Thank you. Hurford and Friends: When I was with you a year ago I did not anticipate that some things were going to happen to me that did happen. For at least four years I had been absolutely certain that under no circumstances was I ever going to be a President of any University anywhere. I had been pretty much impressed by that story of the young instructor and the college president who arrived at the Pearly Gates simultaneously, were greeted by St. Peter, and St. Peter escorted them down the beautiful avenues, and he pointed to a beautiful mansion on the hill, and he said to the president, "Sir, this is where you live."

Meandering down the byways, they came to a very humble shack, and he turned to the young instructor and he said, "Son, this is where you live." Whereupon the young instructor "blew his top" and he said, "St. Peter, I was always told that the injustices

of earth would be corrected in heaven." St. Peter looked at him kind of sadly and said, "Young man, normally that is true, but this is a very special situation. This is the first time we have had a college president up here." [Laughter]

Seriously, however, what I thought was a final decision on my part was motivated very largely by the fact that I had served with three chancellors in one institution and one president in another, men for whom I had great respect and tremendous affection, but they never had time to do the things that were important to me in education.

For the years that I have been in this business, the privilege of working with students, and with faculty in terms of students was the important consideration; and they were so busy trying to keep an institution solvent that they never had time to do either. If there were time today, I would like to tell you why I changed my mind. If a few moments remain, I will briefly, but perhaps they won't. So let me simply say that it is my intention, God willing, to be a president who will insist, first of all, on working with students and with faculty in terms of students, and if I cannot do it, they can have their job back.

The first obligation and pleasure that I have today is to express great appreciation for the folks who have made this year possible for N.A.S.P.A. and for this program. If it had not been for these folks there would not be any program. The Executive Committee was grand. Whenever they were called upon, within the limits of time and distance and circumstances, they came through beautifully.

I cannot tell you how much I appreciate the job that has been done by the Chairmen of our five Commissions and the members thereof. You are going to understand the kind of progress that has been made in one short year. We did not intend that the work of the Commissions was going to be buttoned up this year, and it is not, but I think you are going to be impressed with the progress that has been made.

Then there were scores of people whom I cannot name who individually and collectively contributed critical analyses of previous Conferences which have been taken into account in the planning of this one. Those of our membership who were at the Allerton Conference contributed many ideas. Those of you who were at the Inter-Fraternity Conference did likewise.

Finally, there is one tribute I want to pay, but I think I would like to preface it with a little story that has intrigued me a good deal.

John and Henry were bosom friends from childhood. They went to the same elementary school, high school, played on the same basketball team, visited in each other's homes -- were just as close as two boys can be. Then Henry departed for college and went to Harvard; John departed for college and went to Yale, and they saw no more of each other until one day by sheer accident they bumped into each other in Grand Central Terminal. After the back pummeling and handshaking and all of those things that go with the reunion under those circumstances, John from Yale turned to Henry from Harvard and said, "Henry, I am delighted I bumped into you on this occasion, because I want to ask your advice. I have a very important date tonight. I have sent her a gardenia; we are having dinner at the Waldorf, we are going to the theater, and such-and-such a place; we are having supper somewhere else. Father has sent his car down with the chauffeur to take us around. Now, Henry, under those circumstances do you really think that I should ask her for a kiss?"

Henry contemplates the problem with all of the gravity that it deserves and he finally says, "John, no I shouldn't. I would think that I'd done enough for her." [Laughter]

I want to pay respects to a guy who has never done enough for any of us, and is always willing to do three times as much. He is not a Henry; he is a John who wants to do more and more, and that is Fred Turner. [Applause] When I realized that I had taken on obligations that were not contemplated when you elected me to this office a year ago, I was not worried particularly. Fred Turner was still Secretary-Treasurer and I knew that I was going to be all right.

Then for a while this winter I really began to sweat it out, because Fred Turner was flat on his back, and we are all happy for his recovery, but, gentlemen, under the circumstances you will understand that I was a little happier than you were. Fred did a tremendous amount of work on this program, and we greatly appreciate it. Where is he? Stand up, Fred. [Applause as Secretary Turner arose]

What I shall do today, very briefly, may fall on its face. I think I know where I am going in; I am not quite so sure where I am coming out. This is not an address. It will be very informal, and to a certain extent personal. By nature I guess I am kind of a crusader. I was born discontented, I think. I would love to air some of my prejudices about education, about deaning, but I think I shall not. I do not think this is the year when this Association requires a presidential address of that character.

A year ago Wes Lloyd laid it on the line for us, and after very careful deliberation we took some action. It seems to me that this is the first of perhaps several years of clarification, of consolidation, of an appreciation of what we did and what its implications are.

So, if you will permit me to do so, I am going to briefly review what we did, my understanding of why we did it, and perhaps some personal suggestions of some of the implications. I do this deliberately because what we did last year aroused great interest on the outside of this Association, and some concern inside. We are met this year to get some reports from Commissions which will bear, perhaps more in detail, on some of those decisions we made last year. So I think perhaps it would be appropriate for us to informally review together just what we did so that it may be a background for some of the balance of the program which is to follow.

I think the basic question that is in the minds of a great many people is whether or not what we did last year was a revolution or a clarification of an old historic trend in this Association. I make no bones of the fact that I think it is the latter, and let's just very briefly and inadequately review who founded this Association and what for.

It was founded in 1919, and I am not going to list the gentlemen who did it. We are all tremendously thrilled that Scott Goodnight, one of them, is going to be with us tomorrow. They were gentlemen who were among the first Deans and Advisors of Men. If I understand correctly why such people came to be appointed, it would include these factors:

In the first place, I would interpret it as a reaction against the development of impersonality in education. I think the Scott Goodnights and the men of that time who began to operate as Deans or Advisors of Men began to operate in an attempt to recapture some of the personal relationships which had historically existed in American colleges between the student and the teacher, which were largely lost as American education succumbed to the German influence which minimized teaching and its importance, and overemphasized, for my money, the matter of publication and research. The consequence was that that old relationship is gone.

So those men began to counsel students and to advise students, but very shortly thereafter they began to select young men to be associated with them in that enterprise. So I would suggest to you that we look back to the Scott Goodnights and those of his era and say to ourselves, "What did they do?" not "What was

their title?" What did they do? They surely counseled students. They surely advised some student organizations. They obviously began to select and to train a staff to be associated with them. They provided an educational leadership on the campus in terms of education for the whole student, in counter-distinction to the segmented kind of education that was already taking hold. They began to build a program of personnel work.

Just review those functions which they performed, and doesn't it add up to the word that they were "personnel administrators"? I do not seek to define the word "personnel administrators" in any way, but surely this training of staff, and more particularly the provision of leadership on the campus, the development of a program and the coordination of activities that led to student interest and student welfare would certainly have to be in any definition.

After they began to get started a few years, and particularly with the end of World War I, what happened? We had the impact of a developing psychology on the whole field of personnel work. Very largely as a result of the initial impetus of the testing program in World War I we began to get this whole psychological emphasis with new ideas in terms of the training of counselors and of counseling techniques and of testing techniques, and of all kinds of different tests; and the movement moved along apace so we began to get specialist after specialist -- the placement officer, the student union person, the vocational guidance officer, the officer concerned with loans and scholarships, and so on down a long list. I do not seek to make it complete. I use it simply by way of illustration that within the past few years the personnel profession began to be just as fragmented, and just as specialized as had education generally, for which the founders of this Association came into the picture to correct.

I concede that is a personal opinion, but I have said on many occasions, beginning some years ago, that if we were not careful in the personnel business we were going to lose the student because of overspecialization in exactly the same way as the professor lost him.

We began to be conscious of that fact. We began to be conscious of the fact that in the midst of all these specialties there was an overall kind of a generality (which is not a good word), but it was the administrative aspect in which the general view, the broad view, the philosophic view, if you will, was the predominant feature. So we in this Association for the past 3, 4 or 5 years have been in the process of self-examination and self-evaluation. Where did we fit in this whole personnel picture?

There had grown up in the meantime organizations of these specialists. Where did we fit in connection with them? Just what were we?

It culminated last year, in Wes' challenging presidential address in which the cards were laid face up, in the manner in which they could be ducked no longer. A committee was appointed. Regardless of the merits of a committee, they did labor long and hard, and Vic Spathelf brought in a report for the committee.

What did we do actually as a result of that report? Well, in the first place, we changed our name. I don't think I shall comment on that. Beyond that point it has raised some questions, but if you follow me along the line of the analysis that I have used in too summary a fashion, in an over-simplified way, we would come to recognize that among all of the 52 kinds of titles that were represented in our St. Louis Conference, the one thread that ran most unifyingly through us was the administrative, with the emphasis on that leadership and that coordination and that development of program. So with that as a background, we changed the name to conform to a selected thread of unity.

In the second place we changed their statement of purpose and I want to read that, I think, because it is brief enough to do it and I think as we move into a consideration of some of these reports we ought to have it in mind, and I hope that I am not anticipating these reports too much, but a certain amount of repetition, of course, would not hurt a bit. Our original statement of purpose read like this:

"The purpose of this Association is to discuss and study the most effective methods of aiding students in their intellectual, social, moral and personal development."

We let that stand just as it was, and simply added to it the following:

"The institutions which are the constituent members of this Association..."

May I remind you, as I find some members forgetting, that we individually are not members of this Association. Our institutions are the members, and we are here in the capacity of institutional representatives.

"The institutions which are the constituent members of this Association are represented by those who are primarily concerned with the administration of student personnel programs in colleges and universities of the United States. Recognizing that

many specialized abilities contribute to meeting student needs, this Association seeks to provide and stimulate leadership for the effective combination and utilization of all of these resources.

"As the student personnel program is affected by and affects the entire educational endeavor, this Association cooperates with those agencies and associations which represent higher education, government, community resources, and specialized interests in student personnel work."

We provided for five Commissions. Commission No. 1, on professional relationships, an inevitable consequence of the position we had taken immediately above. We had accepted a cooperative role with other associations, and so on. Therefore, we needed to have perhaps a continuing study of just what that relationship should be with this one and that one, and another one.

We had a second Commission on principles and professional ethics, of fundamental importance to an Association that had reoriented itself in terms of administration.

Thirdly, we had a commission on Division and Training of Personnel Administrators.

Fourth, a committee on program and practices in evaluation.

Fifthly, a committee on the relationships to social science, which was a committee representing the prejudices of some of us that it was about time the social sciences began to make a contribution somewhat comparable to those made by psychology.

I suggest to you, my friends, my personal conviction for your acceptance or rejection, in whole or part, that the action taken, which is summarized thus briefly, is wholly consistent with the entire history of this Association. I find nothing in what we did last year with which a Scott Goodnight and his associates would feel unhappy about at all. Perhaps I am wrong, but I look upon what we did as a clarification of the historic role of this Association in terms of 1952, and the years immediately ahead.

Things had changed. We needed to restate what we were, what we hoped to be, and our understanding of our relationship to the whole picture, and that we did.

Now, before I forget it, I want to report to you on

behalf of the Executive Committee, an action we took yesterday as it pertains partly to this matter of professional relationship and in a sense does anticipate probably part of the report of Vic's commission, but we received an invitation, a formal invitation, from Bob Shaffer, who is also one of our colleagues in this group, who is the new President of the newly organized PGA group. It was a formal invitation for NASPA to become affiliated with PGA as one of its divisions, retaining of course its identity as NASPA, but still being a division of PGA. The Executive Committee voted unanimously to react to that invitation in the negative, but at the same time to make it very clear that we were not thereby rejecting a cooperative relationship.

We have committed ourselves by our very own statement made last year that we will cooperate, but for the time being we feel that it is wise, in terms of the position we had just taken, to continue as an independent organization, ever willing to cooperate with our sister associations in the personnel field, in matters of mutual interest and mutual concern. I report that to you as an action taken yesterday by your Executive Committee.

I said earlier that the action we took last year had caused some interest outside the Association. I think that is true. I think it can also be honestly said that what we did last year was in the main accepted in a very friendly manner by persons whose position in other associations is a matter of consequence. They regarded it, as do I, as a clarification, the result of which could only be good as we move ahead. They are, of course, almost without exception hopeful that our cooperation will be increasingly close and that some of the current difficulties that are obviously immediately ahead can be quickly resolved.

As you may know and as I have said on many occasions, I have no difficulty whatsoever of being a member of the executive committee of ACPA, and at the same time an officer of this Association. I find no conflict whatsoever. The action that we took last year even removes many of the elements of potential conflict that may have existed, because it staked out a special area for ourselves.

There is only one difficulty I see -- and this is a very personal word -- not immediately ahead, but it is one that may arise in three years' time, or five years' time. I think so great has been the outside interest in what we did last year, in terms of its clarification, that we are going to be increasingly faced with applications for new members. I do not believe there is any question about it. There is evidence of it this year.

For me, and I think for most of you, the very finest part of these meetings has been the personal relationship. It has been a relationship which included Assistant Deans as well as Deans, of young men just coming into the business as well as some who were just going out -- a kind of community of interest in which we recognized the great importance of fellowship.

I should personally regret it very much if we ever became so large that that was minimized or destroyed. So I say to you very frankly that you and your Executive Committees in time to come may be faced with the necessity for doing something about that problem if you are going to retain your insistence that this group be small enough so that personal fellowship is at its base.

I think that is all I am going to say about what we did last year, as a background simply for our further discussion. My time is just about finished, otherwise I would like to indulge a prejudice or two. Let me suggest one or two things that I feel very keenly.

I think there are a couple of directions in which this Association and individual Deans, whatever your title, are going with which you must be increasingly concerned. They are not necessarily new, but I re-emphasize their importance. One is the faculty. We have talked about the importance of your taking leadership with the faculty in terms of educating the faculty to be more effective advisers, counselors, of getting them involved in the student personnel program, thereby breaking down this utterly false dichotomy between the curricular and the extra-curricular.

May I simply say to you that as I see the problems of education in the second half of this century, that wall between the extra-curricular and the curricular has to come down. May I suggest to you that ways and means of making faculty understand the essential elements of the personnel point of view, which we have accepted since it was first formulated under the auspices of the American Council, that there has never been a time when that has been quite so important.

May I suggest to you, secondly, that there is a relationship between your job and the objectives of what is coming to be called "general education" that I do not think we have understood.

I suggest to you that personnel administrators ought to become better versed in what is being attempted, thus far pretty poorly, but what is being attempted through what is called

general education. It is a horrible phrase because general education in one thing is so utterly different from what it does in another. In some cases it means the same courses with a different name, as you know. In other cases, it is based on one kind of a philosophy, and another on another, but in all cases there is one element, I think, in common and that is a recognition that for the past fifty years we have been over-specialized in this business, and we have graduated men and women who were highly qualified technically for their profession or vocation, but about as poorly qualified to be citizens as you could imagine. We have graduated kids with specialties who did not have the slightest understanding of the social implications of their specialty.

If I understand general education at all, its attempt is to create a new unity in education, which the fragmentation through over-specialization has completely destroyed.

I am suggesting to you that the very essence of the personnel point of view is wrapped up in these objectives of general education. Maybe through your general education faculty you will find faculty members who will be more ready to understand the personnel point of view, and we may find through the general education program the greatest opportunity we have had yet to break down that wall between the curricular and the extra-curricular. I recommend it to your thoughtful consideration.

I would like to finish by telling a story which I love to tell about the founder of Temple University, where I had a very pleasant association for nearly six years.

Dr. Conwell was the famous "Acres of Diamonds" lecturer. He was in the thick of every single enterprise that was designed to alleviate personnel problems. His friends were saying, "Dr. Conwell, how can you do so much?" He frequently would take them into a little room in his home, on one wall of which was hanging one of these dress swords of Civil War vintage. He said, "When I was a young man I went to war as a Captain in the Union Army. My townspeople presented me with this sword. With me to war, as was the custom then, went an orderly, a sixteen year old boy named Johnny Ring." One of Johnny Ring's pride and joys was to guard the Captain's sword, keep it shining bright. One day when Captain Conwell was away from camp, the Confederate troops attacked, drove the Union troops back across the river, Johnny with them. He suddenly remembered, when he got across the river, that he had forgotten the sword. He returned across the river, got the sword, and sought to retrace his steps.

By that time the bridge was on fire and Johnny's clothing was in flames. The youngster jumped in the river, but it was too late, and Johnny Ring died two days later.

Dr. Conwell would then turn to his questioner and say, "You see, Johnny Ring gave his life out of a sense of devotion to duty, loyalty to a principle. I am therefore compelled to live two lives, one for Johnny Ring, and one for myself."

Gentlemen, I know I do not have to tell you about that compulsion because you would not be in this business if you did not understand it. I am suggesting to you, however, that we have a compelling obligation to make our youngsters understand that these times demand all of us to live two lives, one for ourselves and one for our fellowman. God bless you.

... Prolonged applause ...

CHAIRMAN STONE: Are there any announcements? If not, we will adjourn.

... The Luncheon Session recessed at two-twenty o'clock ...

THURSDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

April 3, 1952

The Conference reconvened at two-forty o'clock, Dean Robert M. Strozier, University of Chicago, presiding.

CHAIRMAN STROZIER: I think we had better get started, although some of the members are still outside.

I did not say so at noon, because I knew I would have an opportunity to say a word this afternoon, but I do want to apologize for being late to the session, especially since I am an officer of this august body, and I was particularly interested in helping set up this program that was given this morning, and I was particularly sorry to miss that.

I think most of you know that I could not be here yesterday, but that I did plan to be here at eleven-fifty last night, but through a chain of circumstances I spent thirteen hours in the airport at Albuquerque, New Mexico, waiting all the time for the plane to take off, and taking off twice, and have one of two motors conk out, so even though I was late I decided I would rather be late to NASPA than early to heaven. [Laughter] When I finally got to the airport in Colorado Springs this morning, I couldn't believe it. It reminded me of a little story that I heard recently about the farm couple who had a very beautiful daughter. This has a very unique beginning. [Laughter]

They lived near a site selected by the Army for a very large air field. The father and mother were very much disturbed about their young daughter with so many enlisted men and officers in the vicinity. They talked with her and prepared her for the coming of this air field to the neighborhood. But it came and she met a great many of them. Things seemed to be going all right, but after several months one evening when the father came home the mother was sitting by the fire, white and drawn, and he knew something was the matter, so he asked, "What's the matter, honey?" She said, "Well, it's happened." He said, "What's happened?" She said, "Susie Mae is pregnant." He stopped a moment and said, "Well! Thank God that's over." [Laughter]

Before I introduce Arno, I will ask Dean Beaty from Florida to say something. He had something he wanted to present.

DEAN R. C. BEATY (University of Florida): Mr. Chairman, there are two members of this Association that a great many of us have known for a long time who are not here today, and they are

not here because they are critically ill. I would like to recommend that we send them a message of greetings and best wishes while we are in session. I refer to Joe Park of Ohio State, former President of this Association and Garner Hubbell of Principia, who was co-host with Arno Haack last year at St. Louis. I would like to move, Mr. Chairman, that we send them a greeting of best wishes.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

CHAIRMAN STROZIER: I know that those of us who have been in this organization for any length of time at all know and love and respect these men. I will put the motion. All those in favor say "aye"; opposed. Carried.

I am sure it will warm their hearts to have these affectionate greetings from their colleagues.

The main business of this session this afternoon, which really precedes the smaller group meetings, is the briefing which is to be done by Arno Haack, our host of last year in St. Louis, whom all of you know. Arno, if you will, give us the word.

DEAN HAACK: Thank you, Bob.

I am sure there is a time in every conference like this one that concentrates fairly heavily on a theme, when there are some who wish there were time enough to really dig into it; and there are, I suspect, some others who wish we would change the subject and get on something else. I am sure that if we had had the opportunity of being where we are now after our opening address and the panel this morning, that we might have planned a bit more incisively for this afternoon's discussion.

I was at the disadvantage -- one of those situations where you open your mouth once too often -- in having the assignment to propose an outline for the discussion this afternoon, and sitting down rather far away from the rest of the program and putting down some thoughts and questions that might be provocative for that type of discussion.

As I look over the outline now I feel that we have caught up in it fairly well, in the significance of two of our sessions thus far. I think just a word in general is probably still in order about the orientation that we have to this subject matter area, and I can summarize it this way.

I hit one of the phrases, one of these kinds of phrases

this year that you come across occasionally that rings in your mind. This one had a bit of a humorous twist. It came to me via Rabbi Sachar, and the statement was this: "The trouble with the future is it ain't what it used to be." [Laughter]

That is pretty profound, I think, and rather indicative of the mood some of us find ourselves in now. We are dealing with a complexity of problems, higher education being only one vantage point of dealing with them. We are concerned about this culture of ours and its inter-relationships in the battle of ideologies which lies ahead, in the deeper meanings that lie behind the implications of our democratic way of life. We are concerned about the groundwork for those convictions.

When we talk about developing a higher sense of values in our students, it is not only a response to a usual situation which we have always been concerned about, but it has at least two additional emphases, I think, right now. One grows out of the emergency situation in which we now find ourselves: Students confronted with military service, with a war situation, which I have on occasion described by saying that this particular situation, unlike those of the past, has an absence of definition. We are involved in a war which is affecting us profoundly and may affect us even more. This particular war has developed neither a cheering section nor an active opposition. We are not for it, and we are not against it. Our thinking has not crystalized. In a vague sort of way it has.

I am amazed, frankly, on my campus at the fundamental vacuum in which I find a good many people are really living, an uncertainty about what things are all about; the unpredictability of the future, particularly for the young man who answers a question on one of our blanks rather consistently, "I can't answer that question because my future is uncertain." Now, of course, his future is not that uncertain, but the significant thing is that he feels that it is.

We are in that kind of a tentative period. And behind that are all of these deeper issues that Dr. Olds touched upon last night, that are so much a part of the literature, the deeper levels of literature, the analysis and discussion of the deeper significance of our period.

That, I think, is the background of our concern this year with this type of question. Now, without any further embellishment, I think I can serve our purposes by focustung on this 4-point outline which is proposed here as a rough guide to our discussion, going through it quickly and pointing up perhaps as

we go through some of the implications in the outline growing out of our other discussions to date, leaving it to your leaders and to your choice as to how you divide your time and concentrate. I admit that this is a very baffling sort of outline to face. If I have any apology for it, it is really that these are not four separate points, but that in a sense they imply to me at least the general framework of an approach to the whole problem, and perhaps that will become clear as we run through the outline.

The first issue, "I. Background Problems Growing Out of a Pluralistic Religious Culture," deals with the issue that was up last night in the discussion with Dr. Olds:

"In a culture which has traditionally derived its values from a positive religious orientation, how can we hope to make a basic impact and side-step any positive institutional position on programs which might claim to have a religious dynamic? Is it possible or necessary for the institution to assume a responsibility for the individual's spiritual or religious development? How is this responsibility to be assumed?"

We divide that into two broad parts, Section A, that problem as it relates to the church-sponsored institutions. In these institutions such responsibility is implicit or actively assumed. I am suggesting as general questions there:

1. Is the assumption active or passive?
2. To what extent is it possible to carry it out in a successful practice?
3. What are the evidences of its effectiveness?
4. Does the religious homogeneity or heterogeneity of the student body, faculty and constituency affect this policy and program?
5. Are there clear trends in the present situation to give more or less active expression to these concerns?

That obviously touches only an aspect of that question. The more significant, or shall I say the more complex part of the problem is in "B": The problem as it is posed in the state-related or the secular private institutions.

In this area there is a basic policy problem involving interpretation of the concept of separation of church and state as well as the question of the effectiveness of programs thus far initiated. It is clear that this question is now under active consideration with an increasing number of institutions struggling with the problem. There are some notable trends:

1. Development of statements of university policy broadened to recognize responsibility for students' spiritual growth and maturity. (There are examples of those kinds of statements.)
2. Experimentation with chapel programs - Deans of Chapel - Chaplains, etc.
3. Experimentation with schools of religion - Bible Colleges - institutional coordinators of Religious Activity, etc.
4. Experimentation with Departments of Religion in the broadening of curricular offerings in the field.
5. Attempts to assure more adequate handling of religious material as it becomes relevant in the teaching of other disciplines.
6. More effective attempts to develop and coordinate extra-curricular religious programs.
 - a) YWCA-YMCA, Student Christian Association, Student Religious Council, etc.
 - b) Relationship to churches, foundations, and other denominational agencies.

Then by way of general questions in this entire area, to sharpen the question up:

1. To what extent is it important for institutions to come to grips with this question? (That probably is the basic issue in this area.)
2. Is it possible for schools in this area to formulate a tenable position and to hope to implement it?
 - a) Is it possible to be as overtly religious or as Christian in a broad sense as we have been in our national life? (The tradition, "In God We Trust", "This Nation under God", etc., or opening sessions of Congress with prayer, chaplains in the armed forces, etc.)
 - b) Is it possible to give content and dynamic meaning to such a broad inclusive concept of religion and to escape the sterility which follows when it becomes merely routine following of tradition? (That is a very penetrating question. If we over-simplify the problem and take a very broad position, is it likely to become meaningless. A very real issue.)

- c) Is a more incisive program possible?
- d) Where does the problem really lie?
 - 1) In a conviction that religious orientation is purely a personal matter to be left to the home and the church? (That we can and should deduct.)
 - 2) In the fear of incurring opposition:
 - (a) In the faculty?
 - (b) In the student body?
 - (c) In the religious community?
 - (d) In the community generally?
 - 3) In the reluctance to promote religion as a general phenomenon because it has at times been, and in certain quarters today is -
 - (a) Opposed to freedom of inquiry
 - (b) Socially reactionary
 - (c) Divisive

That is by way of spelling out some of the issues which are posed in that first area, which is to me at least, if I can get in my own personal comment, a very critical area in this whole field, because we are not, I submit, in the majority of our institutions, or certainly in those institutions which enroll the great majority of our under-graduate students, not coming to terms with this question. I submit that we have neither answered it positively, nor affirmatively. We have drifted, as we well are aware.

The second area deals with the question of values in relationship to the curriculum.

There is a significant trend of active discussion of the subject of values in relation to the classroom particularly in Liberal Arts faculties. There seems to be growing faculty interest in such discussion and some significant experimentation growing out of it.

It seems characteristic of such discussions to avoid the specific question of religion. They do reflect a recognized lack of effective correlation between the values implicit in the concept of the humanities and observable response on the part of students, and there is a very real faculty concern about that. In general, this area represents the attempt to approach the problem via the curriculum. General questions in that area are:

- 1. Is such emphasis on values producing any notable results? What are they?
- 2. Does the objectivity of the academic approach strengthen or weaken the effectiveness of the effort?

3. How are personal commitments to value concepts achieved? What part does exposure via the classroom play in the total process?
4. What would it take to make this approach more effective?
 - a) Recognition that the classroom approach is but part of a total program?
 - b) Recognition that the attitude, background, and general effectiveness of the teacher as teacher and person is critical to the value approach?

What would be the implications of really facing those questions?

The third broad area is the "Relationship of the Emphasis on Values to Problems in the Field of Advising and Counseling," and that is basically the broad area we were in this morning.

- A. Emphasis on seeing the need of the total personality rather than particular course problems in regular faculty advising. The critical factor here is the recognition on the part of the adviser of a responsibility for the total development of the students.
- B. Need for a more effective handling of motivational factors in specialized or general counseling.
- C. Need for better integration of the various advisory and counseling roles i.e., faculty, professional staff, student leadership.
- D. Orientation of student leadership toward a more effective motivational impact on students with whom they deal -- dormitory counselors, fraternity and sorority pledge masters, orientation leaders and responsible activity leaders generally. (A very broad area.)

The last area is perhaps in a sense the most concrete or specific one, and there I am suggesting that we focus our attention on what we have actually been able to put our fingers on thus far in terms of our concrete or our visible program, and that, of course, is a very long list, and I have made it purposely very brief and very partial, but in that area belong the experiences with programs like the religious emphasis weeks, our chapel and/or assembly programs, whether they be at the official university level or at the informal student-sponsored level; (C) Special

programs designed to interpret to the students questions and problems related to the present national emergency and the international situation behind it.

I commented earlier upon that area by saying that it represents I suspect for many of our people a sort of emotional and spiritual vacuum at the present time.

D. In the correspondence that came to Blair Knapp and me in connection with this program, there was this program outline from Purdue that I include here, and the Purdue people can speak to it in the discussion. It is an experiment using practical people, business people, in a program of students to talk about their values of life.

Then finally, for my short list, (E) An appraisal of the effectiveness of special agencies on, or related to, the campus -- YMCA-YWCA, Student Christian Association, campus religious councils, church related foundations, etc.

That, of course, is only a beginning list. There are many other areas of that kind that might profitably be reviewed.

I apologize somewhat for presenting as comprehensive an outline as this, but let me make just one summary comment. If I had a simple statement to make out of my own experience as to how we deal with this value question, my answer would be, we do not deal with it at any one point. It is a corollary of many aspects of our program. I do not personally feel that we can ever solve the problem without coming to grips with the issue in Roman I. I think we have to come to terms with that, with our religious heritage and our relationship to it.

Having said that, I do not believe that we will solve the problem even if we solve that issue. That is a background in a sense. We condition, I think, if we come to clarity there, the atmosphere that is our apriori to the student when he comes to the campus. In discussing this with some of my friends here in this meeting, who come from the church-sponsored colleges, they are saying that they have problems on their campus too which their clarity in Point I does not necessarily solve. Therefore, the position is that this is an adjunct to a total solution to the program. I feel a missing link on many of our campuses; a beginning point in a sense.

It goes from there to an analysis of how this problem is dealt with in the curriculum by the faculty, in the classroom, in the motivational impacts of our total personnel upon the student

in our counseling program, in our attempt to be of help to the growth of the individual at the close inter-personal levels.

It has a great deal to do with the relation of students to the group in the extra-curricular areas or the co-curricular areas. It is related to the extra-curricular activities that take students into relationship with their churches. I do not believe that we can solve the problem by bucking the questions to the churches or to the home. Therefore, in a sense, this outline represents a rough attempt to put down in writing the major points which somehow must come together in the concept of a total university program if there is to be a concept of a program that we can with some justice assume to be valid in terms of the dimension of the problem of values as they become relative to the real thinking and the real living of the students that we are hoping to aid.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further suggestion about the groups, except that I suspect the groups will have to make choices with the time available, and the choices are obvious from the two basic sections that we have already had, in two of the areas that the outline picks up. There is a rough overall integration between Roman numerals I and II of this outline, and the last two sections that have to do with counseling and the present program. A grouping of that kind might be helpful. But I think your resourcefulness is the best solution to that particular problem, so with all best wishes for the discussion, we will leave it at that point.

CHAIRMAN STROZIER: Thank you very much, Arno, for this thoughtful presentation. I am sure that it will provoke much interesting discussion among the members of this group.

Before we break up into the discussion groups, I think there are some announcements probably that should be made to the large group.

... Announcements ...

SECRETARY TURNER: I am going to take some liberties that belong to Blair and you, but I want to do it for a purpose. We have some guests. I do not know whether they are in the room or not, but they should be introduced, and would be later, but it is well that they be introduced now if they are in the room.

Harry Pierson is here from the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers. He plans to attend the Conferences this afternoon. He will make himself known. He is to be with us

for the rest of the meeting.

Is Charlie Pledger in the room? He is probably outside in the sunshine. He is the President of the National Interfraternity Conference. He is here and expects to make the rounds of the groups this afternoon, and expects to be here the rest of the meeting.

Is Dr. Ben Cherrington in the room? He is probably with Harry Pierson and is outside some place. These men do plan to make the rounds of the meetings this afternoon. They will be introduced at the proper times.

In connection with these group conferences this afternoon, Dr. Farnsworth and Dr. Wedge plan to make the rounds and sit in just a little bit, possibly half an hour with each one, and Leo is available if you would like to have this done: Leo could follow around with Dr. Farnsworth and Dr. Wedge, and transcribe that part of your meeting which involves the discussion which goes with them. Do you want to do that? If so, it can be done. It doesn't make any difference. We can let him go out and enjoy the sunshine -- whatever your wish is on that.

While you are on your feet now, the younger man, the man with the black hair is Harry and the man with the white hair is Dr. Cherrington, and here they are. [Applause as they arose]

CHAIRMAN STROZIER: We are glad to have you with us.

SECRETARY TURNER: Would you like to have Leo go with you this afternoon? There will be no transcription of the rest of the meeting, of course, but if you want just that part transcribed for the record it can be done. I think this is important enough so that we ought to try to get it if we can. Let's plan to do it, then.

One other thing. There have been a lot of questions coming to me about the matter of placement. Apparently there is going to be some shifting around this spring, and a number of men are possibly interested in picking up additional men for their staffs. You did not get it before you left, but I mailed to you Friday and Saturday a newsletter with a whole flock of new placement blanks in it, and I think you may find some interesting items in there.

Incidentally, along with the new ones, there are a number of up-to-date blanks on some of our previous people. We

have surveyed the whole group and removed about 80, and a number asked that up-to-date blanks be made for them, and that has been done. You will have a lot of placement blanks in your hands when you get home, some brand new ones, and about fifty that have been brought up to date. You can watch for that.

I think I will take time enough to tell the people where the meeting rooms are, because they are difficult to find if you don't know where they are.

... Announcements about meeting rooms ...

SECRETARY TURNER: Any other instructions I need to put out on this?

CHAIRMAN STROZIER: I don't think so.

SECRETARY TURNER: We have not been too tight on these classifications. If you want to shift from one group to the other, that is your judgment of course.

CHAIRMAN STROZIER: Are there any other announcements that should be made? If not, we will adjourn to the sessions.

... The Conference recessed at three-five o'clock ...

THURSDAY AFTERNOON

CONFERENCE NO. 1

April 3, 1952

... Drs. Farnsworth and Wedge visited Groups #2 and #4 of Conference No. 1, and the following discussions took place in these Groups while they were in attendance..

GROUP #2

CHAIRMAN L. GRAY BURDIN (Butler University): Does anyone have a question they would like to ask?

DEAN I. CLARK DAVIS (Southern Illinois University): Should we be more concerned with what type of standards students have or should we concern ourselves with the fact that they have standards?

DEAN ARCH B. CONKLIN (Bowling Green State University): Should we be concerned about the type of standards that those of us who are older set for them to observe? I think we have gone hog-wild on turning things over to students and neglecting the type of leadership that we ourselves set. For example, at Bowling Green we have always welcomed the various religious activities. We have a noon club there. We welcomed them to the extent that we furnished them housing for their officers and so forth.

We have a student Christian Fellowship which is financed by five or six of the larger churches there. What happens? The Catholic people will not cooperate with the Protestant. The ministers of the Protestant churches get together and fight like cats and dogs over principle, and as to the number of kids in their church or activity in the organization. And they make such darned fools out of themselves, to my way of thinking that it is a wonder to me that any of the other students looking on want anything to do with it.

My point is -- I do not want to be specific, but my point is: Shouldn't the adults, whether they are on the faculty or adults hooked up with the leadership of these various organizations, set the proper example or leadership so that these people will know what they are going to do?

I think a university is as good as its leadership. I think the faculty will be as good as the President and the faculty

makes it. I think the student body will emulate the faculty. If the faculty doesn't know where they are going religiously or sociologically, how in the devil do you expect the students to know? I know I am being a little practical here, but we might as well get down to that, as to stay up in the clouds and say, "Well it's up to the kids to be honest."

DR. WEDGE: Shall I start with that then? Is that enough to start with? [Laughter]

One of the things that characterizes students to us is that they are in a period of transition between the situation in which they look to their parents for total control of their behavior and are not legally, morally, or in fact responsible for their acts except to their parents. We expect them, when they get out of college, to be responsible individuals who are legally, morally and in every other way responsible.

The transition is a very sudden one as they come to college, and they are away from the parents and the close personal control they have had there, and they look to administrations and to Deans for some sort of standard to anchor themselves, and they also look to each other.

It seems to me that it is a very important function of the administration, the faculty, the total university setting, to try to foster and create an atmosphere which both promotes the growth of individual self-responsibility and still demonstrates the ability of the university people to take responsibility themselves. In other words, since this is in a period of transition perhaps from our point of view the best way to take it is down the middle.

I think that giving students too much freedom, as we have demonstrated at Chicago where we still take in people who have gone through two years of high school, some of them as young as 14 years of age (quite a number of them), that they are not yet capable of self-determining action that is at all wise. Yet the administration cannot determine all of their life without meeting a great deal of resistance, so what we have tried to do, as much as possible, is to be honest with ourselves about our responsibilities and I think one of them is the area that you were talking about when we came in. That is the area of cheating on exams, or thievery, or a number of these things which certainly is the responsibility of the administration to look into, to do something about, and to throw the entire responsibility on young students at least is certainly overloading them.

CHAIRMAN BURDIN: May I ask a question in that regard? How do you utilize home influences in, say, the case of the very, very young college students? Do you have any direct relation with the home in order to give him this set of ideals to go by?

DR. WEDGE: We do not. In fact a good many of the younger students who come to us come partly, I think, to get away from their homes. They are very intellectually advanced often and have disagreements with their parents. In fact this is the age group in which direct repressive control from parents and from administrators who come to represent parents is reacted against. However, students cannot, and do not react against an entire social atmosphere.

You see what I am trying to say is that if you can set up an atmosphere in which honesty is looked upon as a good and something desirable in order to get along comfortably, and if this is shown from the top of the administration straight through the faculty, and in the student body, you will have no problems with cheating.

DEAN CONKLIN: Do you feel you can set up that atmosphere by the professor giving out the examination questions and walking out of the room?

DR. WEDGE: I do not. I think the professor is abrogating responsibility in some settings.

DR. FARNSWORTH: You have your first question there as to whether we would be most interested in standards set by the students, whatever they chose to set, or presumably higher standards set by the faculty. I think we would have to say that it does not work out that way in practice, at least in the experience that I have had.

We would not be interested in low standards simply because they were set by the students. What we would be interested in is a cooperative arrangement between faculty and students with a sharing of responsibility -- ultimately of course it is with the faculty -- so that the students can see how faculty members think about these matters so they may set their standards high, at least as high as the faculty members themselves.

I have had a good many years experience serving on a discipline committee officially, both at Williams and at M.I.T., and I never see a faculty-student division. It is always in line with those who have punitive attitudes and those who have this other kind of attitude, which we do not have a very good name for.

This going "hog-wild" as somebody said, by turning things over to students -- I do not quite share the inference that is in that comment. I think I would express it this way, that we may be in too big a hurry to give students responsibility before they have had enough experience to exercise it intelligently or without too much anxiety on their part. They tend to be too strict, as the Dean here mentioned, where they throw people out uncereemoniously and publicly. But when it comes to which one has the higher standards, I do not believe there is a strict division between students and faculty.

CHAIRMAN BURDIN: Thank you very much.

DR. FARNSWORTH: One other question on religion. One of the things that distresses me very much about the behavior of so-called religious groups in the way that you mentioned is their misuse of religion, their narrow dogmatism. They are creating such a sense of rebellion on the part of the students that they throw out the good with the bad, and that is a real problem, and we are all afraid to talk about it. We are all afraid to touch it, and we are afraid to wade into it because we will step on toes and we will hurt feelings, and we do not have -- at least I do not have -- any good answer to that other than to caution the student who is in rebellion, where he is throwing it all out, that maybe this is a passing phase.

One of my Williams students was in that phase, and insisted that he was an atheist, and I raised some questions whether he really believed it or not, and he said, "I am an atheist, honest to God I am." [Laughter]

CHAIRMAN BURDIN: Let me ask you a loaded question. How can we overcome the attitude that exists on some campuses against certain religious teachings or principles? In other words, take for instance on my own campus. One fraternity on Sunday morning prides itself on having a certain percentage of its members attend church; another fraternity does not. Yet I know that the one fraternity who does send 28 members of its chapter to church perhaps lets the message go in one ear and out the other.

What, in your experience, is a very practical way of coming to grips with this antipathy towards the principles of guidance that are found in sound religious teachings?

DR. FARNSWORTH: The only way I know to get at it is through discussion groups with students themselves, where the superficialities and the genuine parts of religion are discussed,

compared, contrasted, so that the more responsible student leaders can come to recognize that integrity is not simply a question of form; it is something very deep.

I am not answering your question the way I would like to because it is so complicated. Another way of saying it is this: That if the faculty members themselves are men of integrity and they combine their religion on Sunday and their religion during the week in such a way as to command the respect of the student leaders then they too will tend to follow suit. But I do think we have a very serious problem in most of our institutions where we have a kind of fashionable antipathy toward religion shown by faculty members themselves, and any criticism of it is met with the reaction, "Well, this is a violation of academic freedom," or something else of that sort, and it is very difficult to get at it. It is just as Kinsley said in his report about how children learn about sex. They do not learn about it from what the parents say; they learn about it from how the parents act when subjects of that sort are brought up. I think that is just as true in the field of religion.

DEAN CONKLIN: Can I give one more example. At our last year's religious emphasis week we had a lot of important speakers, we had meetings in all the fraternity houses and sorority houses. One of the speakers going around I believe was a Unitarian Minister and he had charge of several groups. In his speech he made this statement, "Nobody needs to tell me that a man who was born and lived 1900 years ago by the name of Christ died for me, personally." I am not arguing whether he died for me or not, but think of the impact that that made on that student body. Why, they talked about it for a week. I think they talked more about that than they did anything else that was handed around.

The result is that here are your leaders, they don't even agree themselves, you see. Now how in the devil do you expect to get the kids on the wagon and ride? That is the reason they are not riding. It has to be.

I was the one who said "turning it over hog-wild." I didn't mean entirely, but I think we are always looking for the leadership to come from the student body, and we are not looking at ourselves, and by "ourselves" I mean those who come to our campus, to the leadership we are going to give them, because I believe the students will be as good as we lead them to be.

DR. FARNSWORTH: One of my medical colleagues said to his president, "You will not get anywhere in this question of furthering value judgments and similar questions on the campus

until you hire your new faculty members, or engage your new faculty members as much on the basis of what kind of men they are, what kind of lives they have led, what their personalities are like, until you put as much emphasis on that as you do on their paper weight." The president said, "If I did that, I would have a revolution on my hands." To which my friend said, "The sooner you have the revolution, the better off the school will be."

DEAN HERB J. WUNDERLICH (Montana State University): I would like to raise just this point. Current magazines are bearing on this issue. "Time" recently reviewed your Adler friend. "Life" is reviewing a very extensive article by Mollick. Both point to this problem you raised.

Now we are not in agreement in our western culture as to our basic values. We followed the pragmatic tradition, and it has led from one problem to the next problem to the next problem, leaving our students in confusion. I think that was from Adler's review in "Time" magazine, leaving our students in confusion.

We have an obligation, as paid employees in institutions of higher learning to give something to our students, and as you point out we cannot agree as to what our speaker last night said we need, a credo, or this morning it was said we need some dogma. It seems to me that one of our first problems would be to get a social scientist to work on what we do believe.

I sat at a fraternity party one evening with a historian, a philosopher, a chemist and myself, while the rest were inside at their formal, and I said, "How are we going to explain this current international issue? What is the ideology? What are the dynamics by which we are living as versus another force? Maybe we should write some articles; maybe we should have some discussions. What are we going to do?"

The philosopher said, "I don't know the answer. Look at the bedfellows we've had in our international history in the last four or five years." The scientist said, "I have to look at the facts. I work in my test tubes in my laboratory. I don't know the basic values that are coming out of these stinkpots that I'm working with." The historian said, "All I can do is read the past." You are right, we don't have a clearcut set of credo. Mollick said our basic issue on the international situation today is Russia has a program, we don't like it, but they have a program. They are selling it. What do we have? Man is rational. We have a history of four or five hundred years, and this Mollick article was quite interesting. I recommend it. It is in this current issue of "Life" magazine. We have a history of 500 years of

cultural success and growth, but we have not put on paper what our democratic ideology is, what we should live by, what our religious dynamics are, what our social dynamics are.

I think one of our first jobs will be to get the social scientists to work together, to help us formulate the pattern by which we live, if we are going to assume that responsibility. We cannot settle it here; I realize that; but it is a very serious problem in my estimation.

DR. WEDGE: I would like to make just a remark or two about this. I wouldn't defend Adler for a million dollars, by the way. [Laughter] If somebody offered two million, I might consider a crack at it. [Laughter]

However, a psychiatrist has to be able to say "I don't know" rather often in his life, and this is certainly one place where we would have to say "I don't know." You mentioned a number of specialists who say they do not know the answer as to what is a good man, what is a good action. I should say it does not take a specialist to know the answer. You can practically smell it, because human integrity is something that is to be highly prized and is written all over. There are people who have it, and people who don't have it. You quite often know a phoney from a great distance.

I have been occupied with a problem recently that interested me and that is that the people who "have the stuff on the ball, get there." I am surprised that you find so few phonies in good positions who stay there very long anyhow. The natural selection of the good man is really a remarkable thing, and I think that our own intuitive, simple human understanding of who is a man of integrity and what constitutes integrity, if you like it, natural law determinism, really is probably the most accurate one we have today, rather than any scientific or credo type of expression of what is good. But I do not say this as a psychiatrist, you know. As I have already said, the psychiatrist does not know.

CHAIRMAN BURDIN: Thank you. That was very good.

DEAN DAROLD L. SHUTT (Marshall College): I would like to ask a question that has been bothering me since this morning, in the relationship of the department of psychiatry in a college where we have one, where it is a psychological clinic what do you feel is your responsibility to the administration of the institution in helping us to formulate these opinions that we are talking about here? Do you feel that you have a responsibility, or, on

the other hand, are you medical practitioners who will see only that segment of the population of our campuses which happen to deviate from the normal?

DR. FARNSWORTH: Our main responsibility is toward the entire community, not to those who are in the most trouble, however, by the very nature of things, we have to spend too much of our time on those people who are in the most serious trouble at the moment. We have a dual responsibility. As professional men, our main responsibility frequently is toward the individual who is in the greatest amount of trouble; but we are also citizens who have this higher responsibility which does not frequently come into the treatment situation but which outside the treatment situation we must emphasize very strongly.

That is why we do not want psychiatrists to get burdened down with nothing but treatment of sick students, in order that they may exercise whatever bit of influence they may have in the direction of the betterment of the entire community. That is a tricky subject, all right, but I feel, as you seem to infer that you felt, that we do have a duty to the entire community, to the 90 per cent who do not get into difficulties, perhaps more than to the 10 per cent who do; but mechanically it is hard for us not to spend a lot of time with the fellow in the greatest amount of difficulty. The squeaky wheel gets the most grease.

DEAN SHUTT: Can you signify any methods whereby those of us in administrative positions might better utilize your time while you are on our campuses? We are taking your time and putting you in this situation where you have to take these deviants. It is our fault then, really, as administrators, that that is what is happening to these psychiatrists.

DR. FARNSWORTH: At M.I.T. we think that it is through working with the counselors, with the advisers, or registration officers, as we call them, that if we can work with people who work with other people that that will have a better long-term effect than if we work entirely just at the patient level.

If you do not work at all at the patient level, however, you do not know what is going on. That is where we get our basic information. But we have to work with the persons on the counseling level, specifically, the telephone call at ten o'clock in which Professor X in his chemistry course comments that John Jones seems to be very much upset. He got up at ten minutes after ten and made the statement which antagonized the rest of the students. They spent the rest of the time badgering him instead of getting on with the chemistry. He tried to get it quieted down, but didn't quite know how to succeed. What do I do?

Since we don't know just what to do, we sit down and discuss as much as we can some of the dynamics involved. We might know the individual; it frequently happens that we do. It might be that the person requires some special attention, not from us but from somebody else in the class, from fraternity brothers, from the adviser in the dormitory, or even from home.

Another situation might be that of the professor who feels very sorry for himself. He happens to be a very good man. He has more students coming to him than he can possibly see. He can't get on with his research work. Every time he starts to work a student comes in. He gets frantic, and after a week or two of that he doesn't know what is going on, so you sit down with him. He is not a patient, but he is a friend of yours, and so you discuss ways and means of protecting oneself without antagonizing students. This is an actual situation. You encourage him a little bit. You indicate student opinions about him that have been favorable. Then you suggest that he have some definite office hours that he see students only from three to six on Monday, Wednesday and Friday, and have his secretary say that he is busy at this particular time instead of trying to be all things to all men, and so on.

It is just hundreds of situations like that where I think we are of as much use as we are in dealing with the boy who comes in and who is panicky every time he takes a quiz.

DEAN DICKINSON: Do you make a practice of one of these specifics, of meeting or attempting to meet with advisers or counselors, faculty counselors, in groups to get across certain principles of dynamics of student behavior?

DR. FARNSWORTH: That is a process which we are trying to work out this particular year. The first thing we did in the early part of last semester was to get a group of fifteen faculty members who worked with a man who is primarily interested in helping students improve their study methods.

He worked by the case history method: A given problem comes up and that is discussed by the whole group. After they discuss it fully, then they go on to another problem, and so on. He did that for twelve sessions altogether, twelve 2-hour sessions. The people in that thought it was very helpful.

At the present time we have another group conducted by a psychiatrist, in which they are working through the emotional reactions of the group, one to another, one individual to another, which starts out spontaneously. One thing reminds another

faculty member of another, another one attacks this one for having this particular point of view, then he defends himself. Finally they come to some kind of an understanding of each other's emotional reactions. After they do that for about 12 to 15 times something begins to happen, and that person is never the same again. He is more sensitive, more perceptive in his dealing with students. He is aware of the unconscious motivations of his students. He is aware that he may represent a parent figure. He may bring out rivalry of one sort or another. So he is in a better position to remove some of the barriers between himself and the student in the learning process.

DR. WEDGE: Can I make a little remark further to this point. If we had to give up one or the other of these functions, I should choose to give up the treatment of students. Fortunately we don't have to make that choice.

At least a third of my time -- and I wish it were more -- is spent in just such things as Dr. Farnsworth spoke about. We have groups of house heads, advisers, and the multiple individual contacts which go on around the campus which are most fruitful for both of us, on both sides of the fence. The psychiatrist really learns.

You know, psychiatrists start with the treatment of individuals. When you are on the campus for a while, you become exceedingly alert to the pressures of social situations in the whole campus atmosphere, and all these indefinable, intangible things that Deans know more about than psychiatrists, and we grapple with these just as hard as you do, but in our inter-change something usually happens to both of us, for the betterment of both of us.

DEAN JOHN E. HOCUTT (College of William and Mary): Dr. Wedge, you spoke of being able to recognize the phoney from the person of integrity. I would like to ask a question, and it may be an absurd question. I think I have my own answer, but is every phoney to be regarded as a patient for the psychiatrist? [Laughter]

DR. WEDGE: No.

DEAN HOCUTT: What I am trying to say is this, in every instance of cheating do you look for something fundamentally mixed up in the person's background that he should be sent to the psychiatrist for help?

DR. WEDGE: Yes -- not necessarily in his background,

maybe in his immediate situation. Psychiatrists have one fundamental belief, that perhaps will make you a little uncomfortable, and that is: The psychological determinism. Every act is the outcome of some motivation, cause-effect in a sense.

When acts transcend socially accepted lines, then they should be examined. So in a sense every case of cheating is a psychological aberration either from the pressure of the present, of an impulse now that is not satisfied, or from poor formation of the character from past situations. That does not mean, however, that we attempt to treat every case of cheating psychologically. Most often a student who is fundamentally sound and goes off the beam a little bit simply needs a little correction from the Dean of Students and from psychologically sensitive or understanding advisers, teachers, people around him, and the phenomena is gone.

So the answer to your question is yes, but the psychiatrist does not have to treat them all.

DEAN GUY T. MC BRIDE (The Rice Institute): Although I did not hear all of the discussion, it seems to me that you fellows have been discussing whether or not it is possible to arrive at a code of ethics acceptable in this society, and have it taught along with the other elements of the general education.

This is also a question which was touched upon by Dr. Olds last night, if I interpret his remarks correctly. I would like to ask either of these gentlemen, not as psychiatrists but as trained observers in leading scientific schools, if they have observed any tendency on the part of the faculty to resist either the formation or the teaching of a code of ethics along with the scientific content of their general work? Is the faculty antagonistic to this teaching, are they neutral, are they determined to be neutral, or are they in favor of it?

DR. FARNSWORTH: I think most of them on the surface have pretty much the same idea as Calvin Coolidge's preacher about sin; that is, they are against it. They are for it, but they haven't any idea how to go about it.

I believe that the members of our own faculty are very anxious about the problem, the same as we are, but are fearful of sticking their necks out, as individuals, as I am myself, in one sense of the word. I think educational institutions are afraid to become ethical, really, for a lot of very good reasons, and as individuals I think we are likewise afraid. But I do not believe that there is much active resistance on the part of the faculty

members that I know. Most of it is a passive kind, based largely on feelings of futility about the immensity of the problem.

DEAN RAY C. PELLETT (Western Michigan College): I would like to have this question resolved by our friends here, if it is possible; How can we send the student into the classroom, particularly in the social sciences and in psychology, and have them taught day after day, week after week, month after month, that they are creatures of their environment, they are products of past experiences, that what they do they cannot help because they do what they do because of the experience they had yesterday; then take them, as I gather from the discussion, and try to orient them into a self-directive individual, and yet send them right back into the same classroom that they came from to their office. They go back to that same classroom, and the same teacher continues to tell them that they are creatures of their environment, and there isn't anything they can do about it.

DR. WEDGE: They are creatures of their environment. There is something we can do about it. That is something we have to teach, that is, the teachers of psychology or sociology who are the most ardent environmentalists in the world.

If this philosophy were truth, psycho-therapy would be impossible. We would practically quit.

DEAN PELLETT: How are you going to resolve the dilemma the student is thrown into? You tell him he can do something; the psychologist in the classroom tells him he cannot, that he is a creature of his past experiences and that is it. That is a comfortable philosophy to live by, because then I am not responsible for anything I do.

DR. WEDGE: I see that in very young students, but fortunately they usually grow out of it. I think the best thing you can do is demonstrate that they can do things about it.

CHAIRMAN BURDIN: Aren't you assuming that no sense of personal integrity can arise out of that dilemma?

DEAN PELLETT: I want to see it come, but I want to see that the student is not eternally thrown into this dilemma. He has one idea here, and I am taking the other side of the picture. What about the things that the faculty do to the students, and what can we do, how can we resolve this difficulty of the students, or can we help resolve it perhaps by getting some resolution on the part of the other side of the picture or the rostrum, the faculty?

DR. FARNSWORTH: I raised an eyebrow last night when Dr. Olds said that the student who stole the \$57.00 did it because of his teaching in the social science department. I was not able to follow the logic there. I thought something big was missed. I am not prepared to say exactly where it was missed, or who missed it. I wondered if the same logic should apply to the divinity students who cheated, but that subject was not brought up.

I would be inclined to think that the social scientists I know are not quite as extreme as you have made them out, for purposes of this discussion. I think that some antidote might be obtained if the institution itself could make it crystal clear to every student there that the standards must be lived up to, that everybody was expected to live up to them, faculty and students alike, and that that would be an antidote towards those few instructors who do tend to teach the student that he is not responsible for himself, but is a creature of his past.

DEAN CONKLIN: Isn't there a danger of the departmental instructor handling a subject purely in his own field, and the student does not get the overall picture? For instance, sex relations: There is a moral side to it, there is a pure psychological side, and a sociological side, we will say. I will be specific again. A boy in the Dean's office, just before vacation, said, "I have to hand in a paper before I go home to my psychology professor, and I know I will get an "A" in it if I write on sex relations and my experience in it." He said, "I am a little short on it, so I will go out and get some experience."

The point is, they were talking about instincts, and purely that, without the moral side of it at all. The students in there discuss sex, sex, sex, all semester long, and that side of it without any of the other side, and consequently they go out in the field and go to practicing. [Laughter]

DR. FARNSWORTH: I wonder if there was a psychiatrist on the campus, whether he didn't have some business on the campus, and not with the students.

DEAN SHUTT: I would like to throw another sour note out here. In the discussion a minute ago it was brought out that these psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, religious workers and so forth have responsibilities to the administration of the institution. How do they justify their inactivity, shall we say, or their reluctance to let us know when a condition exists on the campus that is liable to blow the very lid off? Now would you like to answer that?

DR. WEDGE: Delighted. [Laughter] We don't justify any such thing. In the first place, if there is a situation which is going to blow the lid off, we are very happy to share the responsibility. Those situations do not come up too often, fortunately. If they are situations of less danger to the campus, the in-between ones, we do not think it is helpful to the students particularly to communicate with the administration, but to take as much responsibility as we can in dealing with the problems ourselves, and we do a good deal of work in an attempt to solve problems which could become problems of the Dean of Students, before they become problems for the Dean of Students.

The Dean of Students does not like to deal with many of the problems which do end up on the psychiatrist's doorsteps. We try to keep him from having to deal with them, but I assure you that if a serious blow-up on the campus seems to be in order, that we are very, very quick to indicate that something needs to be done about it, and if an individual student is himself dangerously disturbed we either get him out ourselves, or we take the responsibility of telling the Dean of Students that he needs to be gotten out and something needs to be done.

DEAN SHUTT: Of course, I had a specific case in mind in which a young lady blew the top of her head off, and when I approached our psychiatrist who had been working with the young lady without my knowledge for some time and asked him if he thought that the young lady was dangerously insane, and that she probably had suicidal tendencies, he said, "Oh yes, I could have predicted it several months ago." Then is when I raised in my own mind the cloak of secrecy which went around his handling of the case, when, had we come into it, we may have been able to save a life, or at least keep the college from getting some very undesirable publicity. [Laughter]

DR. WEDGE: The Board of Trustees at the University of Chicago has instructed the Board of Psychiatrists that they prevent troubles of this kind if possible, and they prevent adverse publicity. We are very lucky. We have almost a negative suicide rate. Occasionally a psychiatrist does have, in the interests of the students, to take some degree of risk. When I say "calculated risk," I mean carefully calculated. That is, they should not, in my opinion, take an untoward risk with any student that is liable to act the way this one did. Had I known it was very likely that a student was going to blow the top of his head off, I should have taken very strict action, not through the administration, however, but through medical channels to see that something was done about it quickly -- hospitalization if necessary.

... Remarks off the record by Dr. Farnsworth ...

CHAIRMAN BURDIN: Dr. Wedge, I would like to ask you a question. What is the relationship between the psychiatric treatment of self-development, and psychiatric treatment that incorporates some type of the institution of standards of conduct or high moral behavior? Is there a relationship from the psychiatric point of view, or do you limit yourself to getting the patient to see himself?

DR. WEDGE: I think I understand you.

CHAIRMAN BURDIN: What I am trying to say is this: As far as this discussion is concerned, I can see that you psychiatrists leave patients to see themselves in a new light. Does that new light incorporate any kind of high moral standards that we as personnel workers can apply in a non-professional way.

DR. WEDGE: No, it does not. We do not set moral standards for any patient. What we find is that if a person sees himself clearly enough, and sees why he does something, and sees that this is really being more uncomfortable and it isn't a solution to his problems, that he changes. He changes not in the direction of standards which we set for him, but in the direction of standards which he really has inculcated in him from his very earliest experience with other human beings.

CHAIRMAN BURDIN: Self-discovery, in other words?

DR. WEDGE: Yes. Those are moral standards. They are already set for us.

CHAIRMAN BURDIN: That is what you were bringing out as an opposition, weren't you?

DR. FARNSWORTH: The psychiatrist needs a strong climate of opinion supporting decent behavior, so that as he treats the student there is a supporting environment to help the student adjust on a plane which is best for all concerned.

CHAIRMAN BURDIN: Would that not suggest then that our titles sometimes are wrong? Perhaps we are not student personnel workers; perhaps we are faculty personnel workers in certain respects.

DR. FARNSWORTH: It always comes back to the faculty member.

DEAN WUNDERLICH: Could I suggest that one way we might resolve this lack, this gap, I should say of communication between the professional counselor, clinician and/or psychiatrist would be the development of a higher type of professional standard, training or rating on the part of the Deans, so that you would be willing to communicate a little more frequently and in greater detail, just as you do among your fellow M.D.'s and professional workers. We know that M.D.'s transmit the medical records. Do you fear we will not understand what you are saying, or misuse what you have discovered?

DR. WEDGE: That is a highly individual matter. I am sure communication is much greater than we have indicated to you in many, many individual instances when we know our Dean. The problem is one of medical ethics, and when you come up against an ethical problem like this, you must behave in terms of your devotion to the patient and what he has told you. This is sacrosanct and it is one of the main reasons that we are so valuable to our patients. Without it we could not help them very much at all, because the gates would be shut. So as a practical matter of maintaining communication, of being able to help students, we have to have complete confidentiality, or at least they have to feel that it, and only in very specific instances, with a very much trusted Dean - which fortunately most of us are acquainted with that are in the work -- can we go beyond this.

But officially we must say and actually we usually behave without feeling that it is necessary, as long as the Dean knows we are carrying out our function responsively and he does not have to worry about the medical treatment.

DR. FARNSWORTH: There is a kind of communication without assuming that it is John Jones who has the illness. There is a communication of students problems from other campuses or from previous years, or all kinds of ways to increase the amount of information which the counselor can have about emotional disorders. That is quite necessary. It is just that we do not want to tell which patient has which difficulty in order to embarrass him.

We are going to have to go. We are slowing up here.

CHAIRMAN BURDIN: We appreciate your kindness in coming. You have been a great stimulation and value to us. Thank you very much. [Applause]

GROUP IV

CHAIRMAN DEAN BERNARD L. HYINK (University of Southern California): Dr. Wedge and Dr. Farnsworth are with us for a few minutes. They are rotating among these Groups, and we would like to have you come up for a few minutes, if you will.

SECRETARY TURNER: I think we had better question them while they are here. They have spent all their time in one now and they couldn't get away from it, so we had better use them while they are with us.

CHAIRMAN HYINK: Do some of you have specific questions you would like to raise with these two gentlemen?

SECRETARY TURNER: I most certainly do. I had three written down this morning. I had two of them in, but the third one I didn't get in. I was not satisfied with Dr. Wedge's answer about the relationships between these groups.

I am perfectly willing to concede that his is the good situation, but let us take this theoretical situation where there is friction. It is just theoretical, but there are such situations and I am familiar with them. Where there is friction between these groups, how will we do something about it?

DR. WEDGE: Between which groups?

SECRETARY TURNER: Between the psychologists, the clinical psychiatrist and the clinical units, all playing for the top spot in the thing. How do we resolve those jealousies? I agree with you that they can work together, but I am concerned because I know in some places they are not.

Do not get me wrong. I was not dissatisfied, but there was not time to go into it this morning, and I think we have to work on it a little bit.

DR. WEDGE: I visited a large mid-western university and talked with a good many people on the campus, and in a survey recently one of the members I talked with was the head of a counseling center, and it took us forty-five minutes, out of one hour that we had together, to get over this very problem. But I am very happy to tell you that we got over it in forty-five minutes. What we discovered was that it was really a historical problem with both of us.

I went to talk to this counselor, sat down with him, and

he began to tell me some of his woes with past psychiatrists who had served on that campus, and who saw their role as only helping psychotics, totally disturbed students, and he also talked about some of the attitudes that the psychiatrists are said to show toward psychologists, and that is that the psychiatrist must always be in the saddle, and so forth. The more we talked, the more we understood each other.

I think that between men of understanding and of good will these problems would not exist in individual situations very long. That is, neither the psychiatrist, the psychologist nor other members of this group has a special interest to defend. If he has axes to grind, special interests -- you know, being at the top, and so forth, is violently important to him -- if he has not matured beyond that point you never will solve that problem. However, if he has real good will and if he has no special interests there is no possibility that it cannot be worked out.

Does that satisfy you a little more?

SECRETARY TURNER: Yes, it does indeed. In other words, you brought out the very thing I thought we passed over lightly this morning. If they are willing to get down on the basis of maturity they can be resolved.

DR. WEDGE: You understand, it takes time, good will, and overcoming history.

DEAN HAACK: Isn't it a problem of personnel administration in part? Taking my campus for example, I could pick clinical psychologists and psychiatrists from my staff and they would fight like cats and dogs, while others I could pick would work together beautifully. There are known factors, at least we know them, about the varying points of view in the field. There are those who are skilled in cooperation, who are past the historic differences, and they are the people who can help us.

DR. WEDGE: Say among psychiatrists, there are as many opinionated psychiatrists as there are preachers or other kinds of persons. You do not want an opinionated psychiatrist on your campus -- better, I think, none. The conclusion I came to, from the examination of the same university that I have spoken of already, is that no psychiatrist is better than a poor one, because a man who is not willing to cooperate, as you suggest, and who is not flexible and cannot give and take, is a liability not only while he is there but for what he leaves behind him.

CHAIRMAN HYINK: Dr. Farnsworth, do you want to add anything to that?

DR. FARNSWORTH: I would just like to emphasize the point that if a psychiatrist goes into a situation like that, he ought to go in in an unoffensive manner and not try to usurp any powers, or assert any particular dominance at first, or ever; just let his own work speak for itself. John Weir and I talked about this problem yesterday.

Traditionally there is a great deal of suspicion between psychologists and psychiatrists, which we would like to see eliminated entirely, but unfortunately we have a good many rather self-centered psychiatrists who think of psychologists as a threat, and vice versa, and until we can grow up ourselves, we will continue to have difficulty. An immature person can contaminate the other one, if he is patient enough.

DEAN HURFORD E. STONE (University of California): Not to imply at all that there is nothing of religious significance in Fred's question, but I wonder whether it might be significant in that the answer would be to have both the psychologists and the psychiatrists get religion. Maybe that would be the answer. [Laughter] I would like to see if we might bring our doctors into the discussion at this point on the topic that was before us this afternoon, namely the effect of religion on the college campus.

I would like to ask to what extent do they find over-emphasis, shall we say, an emotional over-emphasis or commitment to certain religious patterns or procedures contributing to emotional disturbances?

DR. WEDGE: We have represented on the University of Chicago campus members of nearly every religion you can think of. Not only do we have combinations of five theological schools all thrown together, but also a rabbi, a Catholic priest, and a well-known canon of the Episcopal church, and all, I am very happy to say, are very sensible men, all those who are officially connected with the campus.

To a psychiatrist, religion is one of the most constructive forces in modern society, and to many, many individuals. The psychiatrist cannot himself have interests in influencing any of his patients toward a particularly religious attitude; however, when he finds that a person has a religious affiliation he is often able to work with the minister or priest, if he is an understanding person, in an extremely constructive way.

I have not been personally impressed by the hyper-religiosity, or too many diverse religious trends, actually.

Perhaps the most dangerous religious trend we had, which lasted some six months in one form or another, was dianoetics, which was gone into with a religious fervor and a psychological system that has been heard by all of you. I hope I am not stepping on any toes here, but dianoetics had its brief religious fervor on the campus.

Such things have usually been grabbed on to only by really already disturbed people. I don't think they cause disturbances in people. I think they are the straws that the drowning man grabs on to. Eventually, if the straw is not substantial enough, he will have to do something else. We hope that what he will do is go to his Dean, adviser, or some intelligent, understanding person, or the psychiatrist who can help give him a little direction in his life.

DR. FARNSWORTH: I would like to make one comment. Traditionally Freud is supposed to have been anti-religious. It doesn't make much difference now whether he was or whether he was not, because he himself said that a science that cannot forget its founder will not progress.

To jump a bit here now, a religious magazine made a very bitter attack on Karl and Bill Menninger because they were Freudians and hence anti-religious. I thought it was a bit foolish and a bit unfair because both Bill and Karl happen to be very devout Presbyterians and their father is likewise similarly such, so that his sons say he is a really saintly man, even though he is their father.

... Remarks off the record ...

DR. FARNSWORTH: The point I want to make by these little anecdotes is that psycho-analysts or psychiatrists may be either religious or non-religious, just as a Dean may be. That is, there is nothing inherently in psychiatry that is either opposed to or strongly favors any particular type of religion, although I think there is a very definite movement within psychiatry to exercise a more positive attitude about the necessity of some kind of a religious faith because if the patient doesn't have it then he is going to take up a substitute which may be an ideology. It may be dianoetics; it may be any of the other things that a person hooks on to when a screw is loose somewhere.

CHAIRMAN HYINK: Arno, did you have a question a while ago?

DEAN HAACK: I have a question that grew out of this

morning, and I think it does tie in. It is really sort of a double question. It came out of the discussion of referrals and cross-referrals, and how the traffic is handled within a complex situation. One aspect of the question is: Since psychiatrists are few and far between, they are hard to come by, and because the need for that type of service is obviously growing as we define more accurately, and because referral to the psychiatrist on the average campus still remains a problem because it will be some time before the attitudes of understanding are commensurate with our understanding, is there a value or a possibility in the process of normal referral through counseling?

That is to say, the student will go to counseling more readily than he will go to the health service for psychiatric help. Cannot our counseling staff be a screening level with a normal cross-relationship?

DR. WEDGE: Yes, there is. You have a representative of the counseling service, John Weir, who knows when to refer to a psychiatrist and is able to do it without any difficulty at all. About the problem of non-acceptance of psychiatry, that is one which I would not be in a hurry to overcome. A little time does marvelous things. The most people who come to us come because word-of-mouth has gotten around among students -- they are not referred by anybody -- that there are some people over here who have something sometimes that may be helpful.

In a year or two, with a few good experiences, things straighten out pretty much, and the psychiatrist becomes accepted as part of the college curriculum, or the college program. Since we are not going to solve all of the problems immediately -- and don't believe that a psychiatrist coming to a campus solves all of the problems of the Dean -- I think we can take the time to gently get acquainted, and let, in a sense, the product sell itself.

DR. FARNSWORTH: On that question of acceptance at M.I.T. the students accept it more readily than the faculty members, particularly one or two years ago that was true. It is getting nearly even now. Our girls who have to make the appointments are just literally snowed under beginning about the first of November and extending through until late in May, not by people coming in wanting to see a doctor, but coming in, "I want to see a psychiatrist." They will say, "There is no appointment open until Wednesday, a week from now." "I have to see him this afternoon. I can't wait." Then she has to decide whether somebody else gets bumped off the schedule, or whether he must wait, and usually the student will help decide. They have to use a good deal of judgment

as to whether it is a real emergency or not. We are embarrassed not by lack of acceptance, but by the boys coming in very bluntly, "I want to see a psychiatrist," and they do it apparently with the same tone of voice as they say they want to see a dental hygienist or anyone else. We think that is a healthy attitude, and we do not think people come just to tell about themselves. The percentage of people who come unnecessarily is exceedingly low.

I made this challenge to one doubting man not so long ago: Just come and let me take out any case history at random, and let me give you the essential facts, and see whether you think this person is deserving of some help or not.

DEAN BALDWIN: Cannot your counseling men work as a team on this, because we get a lot of those requests with us and consequently we make the decision rather than have a secretary make it. Quite often we follow up, quite often the psychiatrist refers them back to us and we can handle it in consultation with them, which relieves their load because they cannot handle all the boys who come in.

It seems more logical to have some counselor handle these cases than have a secretary handle these cases, who was hired just yesterday.

DR. FARNSWORTH: We cannot have a secretary who was "just hired yesterday" doing that, and we do not. We know that when we get a secretary who has a good sense of who is disturbed and who is not she is a jewel beyond price. It is much better, as you suggested, to get the counseling system working in that capacity.

DEAN BALDWIN: We have a liaison, who is on our staff and the medical staff, a woman who ties the two together in many cases, where neither one of us can handle it, borderline cases, so we get some help from her, and she is in consultation with the psychiatrist and she is in consultation with us. That works for a good combination.

CHAIRMAN HYINK: I understand we have about ten minutes left with these gentlemen.

DEAN CHAFFEE HALL (University of California): Is it customary, in most universities as it is in ours that most students will see a psychiatric social worker and in almost all cases the preliminary interview is conducted by such a person, rather than their seeing a doctor immediately, unless it is

regarded by the screening agency to be an emergency?

DR. FARNSWORTH: In our place it is a question of budget to some extent, and shall we spend the amount of money that we have available on psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, or just what. My own view on this is that the screening had better be done by either a psychologist or a psychiatrist. In our particular setup the ratio is five psychiatrists to one psychologist. We would like to have a psychiatric social worker if we just had a little more money for it, but I am a little bit doubtful, even if we did have, whether we would let her do the screening or not. I would be inclined to think it would be the function of the psychiatrist. Some of them would do a better than others, but just on general principles I would rather have the psychiatrist or the psychologist take a look first and then let the social worker get a good deal of the necessary information that is not obtained by deep probing.

DR. WEDGE: To show that we do not always agree, and to show that nothing is customary in this field yet, and anything goes you know just so long as you have good people around, I would take the opposite view on the question of having psychiatric social workers interview people first. In the institutes for psychoanalysis in Chicago the social worker does a very wonderful job on that. If you can get a psychiatric social worker who is truly skillful, well educated, has had the experience, you cannot beat them in this function.

DR. FARNSWORTH: She will do better than the psychiatrist in therapy in some instances there. [Laughter]

DR. WEDGE: Yes, indeed.

DR. W. B. REA (University of Michigan): I would like to combine three questions, with reference to this communication angle covered quite thoroughly this morning. I am wondering if, in the opinion of Dr. Wedge or Dr. Farnsworth, the industrial psychiatrist differs in status, or in comparison with the university psychiatrist? I have received the impression that the industrial psychiatrist has a first obligation to management rather than to the individual worker interviewed.

Secondly, does the payment of a fee in any way clarify or entitle the privilege of having a confidential communication?

Third, what is the opinion with regard to the signing of a waiver by a student, either upon entering the institution or upon entering the health service, which would release for administrative use, if necessary, such information as might be available?

Am I burdening you too much on that?

DR. FARNSWORTH: To start in reverse order, I would look with great suspicion on any waiver. Offhand, I would not request any student to do that. I think it has potentialities for difficulty that I would not want to get into.

The second question, the payment of a fee does not alter the physician-patient relationship one iota, one way or another.

The first question, the industrial psychiatrist may function in one of two capacities. If he functions as an agent of management, then he is of almost no use to the individuals and so he can only work in groups, work with questions of morale, questions of friction between supervisor and employee, and he might be very helpful under those circumstances. But if he is going to come in to help individual themselves, then he must not be identified with management, else he is prostituting psychiatry. That is, he must be either one thing or the other. He must be either a neutral consultant, just as he is in an educational institution, or else he must be an efficiency expert, in which case he is an agent of management. That is strictly my own opinion.

DR. WEDGE: I would approach this point a little differently, although I have the same opinion as Dr. Farnsworth.

The usefulness of a psychiatrist to his patients and to the institution has a direct relation to the belief and trust his patients have in him, in his honesty about this particular matter, and in their ability to tell the psychiatrist with real confidentiality his innermost problems, particularly concerning his behavior. Now, this only works because Deans of Students and psychiatrists have in many places learned to trust each other quite implicitly, to trust each other's judgment.

I think the psychiatrist does not want to look closely into the administrative activities of the Dean of Students, nor is that his business. Similarly, the Dean of Students must trust the psychiatrist to be responsible and take responsibility when it is demonstrated over and over again that he can do so. He has no problem about relegating all medical responsibility to the psychiatrist, you see. That is why we do not need quite so much communication, except in distinct cases such as disciplinary cases or admissions cases, which are referred to us by the Dean for an opinion. We do not need so much communication because we feel that we do work in separate disciplines but for the same goal.

DEAN REA: Just to be specific, if the industrial

psychiatrist, through conferences with individuals, identifies an aggressive homosexual is he not obligated to alert management?

DR. WEDGE: If he does, he will not last. He will not keep the confidence of the people around him. This may happen once successfully, but not three times successfully, and he will not get in contact with any more overt homosexuals. No more will come to him. They will hide their problem from him. He is the last man they will tell, and he is probably the only man who could help them with it. If the industrial psychiatrist is wise, he will not tell management, I think, but he will do everything in his power either (1) to correct the condition if it is correctable, or (2) to get the man in a situation where the man himself will be more comfortable and if possible out of the industrial situation.

DEAN BALDWIN: He would not want to take that job on unless he had that understanding before he took the job.

DR. FARNSWORTH: Right. There is a group that formulated the customary codes of ethics about psychiatrists in industry and if you drop me a note I will be glad to send it to you.

MR. HARRY PIERSON (National Association of Foreign Student Admin.): I would like to take advantage of my presence here to ask a question on the problem of the foreign student. It seems that the stranger in our midst has probably very many problems which impinge on the psychiatric. I would like to ask these questions which end up in one overall question.

Is there likely to be any compounding difficulties in the detection and treatment of psychiatric difficulties in foreign students? Does the lack of language facility tend to hide difficulties, while increasing them? Therefore, shouldn't the counselor be especially alert in problems of this kind? And the overall question is: Are the same assumptions likely to be true in the cases of foreign students as American students?

DR. WEDGE: The answer to all your questions is yes. [Laughter] Certainly the foreignness of people tends to hide their problems and the little bit of "queerness" is concealed in their foreignness. Foreign students represent a real problem to us in many ways, not only psychiatric but, for example, tuberculosis -- how they get in the country I don't know, but they do in droves. This is a liability we accept when we take foreign students. We know they are going to be more trouble to our universities but we think it is worthwhile to do it.

As to the question whether the people are the same all over, they surely are, and outside of the minor customs with which we do not really concern ourselves too much, we find that the same rules hold the world over.

MR. PIERSON: Thank you.

DR. FARNSWORTH: We have 460 foreign students, I believe, at M.I.T. and while I am assured by some of my Indian friends that the Indian students do not have psychiatric difficulties, we have our usual quota of them. The language difficulty is greatest their first semester or two, of course, but actually we do not make very much of a separate problem out of the foreign students, but we do have to be a bit more on the alert. Your friend, Paul Chalmers and I have a lot of discussions back and forth about what we are going to do about this situation and that situation, especially when some of their social customs are just a little bit hard to understand by some of our people.

CHAIRMAN HYINK: Thank you very much. Fred, do these gentlemen have to get on to another group here?

SECRETARY TURNER: If they have time. We hope they can.

DR. FARNSWORTH: Just one more statement. Judging from some comments we had earlier this morning, the psychiatrist is not interested in horning in on the Dean's territory. [Laughter] I might emphasize that because there are far too many problems to be handled. All he wants to do is to somehow or other get the acute problems that he sees in dealing with extremely sick people, to get the lessons that he learns from that, somehow or other digested in such a form that he can bring them back so that they become common property of the educators generally. I think that is the primary function of a psychiatrist.

We are deeply disturbed because we have 700,000 psychotic people in this country, two or three other million people who are practically sick, and so we feel that unless we come out of the hospital and make a spectacle of ourselves, like we did today, that we are not doing our social duty; but we have no desire whatsoever to invade the Dean's territory any further than the Dean himself wants us to. We have never had any difficulty, when we come up against our Deans. It is only a theoretical objection.

CHAIRMAN HYINK: Thank you, Dr. Farnsworth and Dr. Wedge. You can "horn in" on my problems any time. [Applause]

... Drs. Farnsworth and Wedge, due to the lateness of the hour, were unable to visit either of the other two groups ...

THURSDAY EVENING SESSION

April 3, 1952

The Conference reconvened at seven-fifty o'clock, President Knapp presiding.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: This is a pretty important deal, and we are waiting for a few customers who are trying to pay their checks.

DEAN JACK MATTHEWS (University of Missouri): I would like to make a suggestion while we are waiting, if I may. I assume this will be taken care of as it was last year. I would like to suggest that before noon tomorrow that we have run off a couple hundred copies of the names of the individuals here, the schools that they represent, so we can take it back with us.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Fred, will you report on that?

SECRETARY TURNER: The stencil was cut this evening. Where is it now, Juan?

DEAN REID: It is up at the college being run right now.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: It will be back in the morning.

While we are waiting, may I explain that I am going to ask Vic to make the report. After he has made it, we will interrupt just long enough to have copies of it distributed, because such recommendations as he will make you may want to refer to in the discussion. We feel maybe the presentation of the report will go a little more smoothly if we do not rustle papers and what not, but there will be plenty of time for discussion. That is why I would like to have these front seats filled, so that we really can make this a discussion meeting.

SECRETARY TURNER: Let's introduce Bill Dentzer.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Is Bill Dentzer here from N.S.A.? Stand up and be recognized. This young man is President of N.S.A. [Applause as he arose] We are happy to have you with us, sir.

MR. WILLIAM DENTZER (National Student Association): I am happy to be here. I would like to meet you all later when you have time. Say a "hello" to this face, and it will say hello back.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: How is the state of Ohio, or haven't you been back?

MR. DENTZER: I was back a month ago.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: I would not like to begin without a full complement because of the importance of this report, but if you are ready to take it, we will begin. This is the first Commission report. It is a most vital one. It is submitted with the thoughtful consideration of the gentlemen who made up this Commission, who are among the most respected folks we have had in this little show of ours for some time. It is submitted as being worthy of your thoughtful, considerate, sympathetic consideration, which does not leave out critical consideration if you so wish.

I give you the gentleman who has spent hours and hours on this project, for which I am very deeply grateful. Vic Spathelf. [Applause]

DEAN VICTOR F. SPATHELF (Wayne University; Commission I on Professional Relationships): President Blair and Members of the Association: I think to begin with I would like to convey to you the feeling of our Commission, my own personal feeling on the difficulty in preparing this report for you in the form in which it will be presented tonight.

At the outset last year when we assumed responsibility for this work, this difficulty was not quite as apparent. It became an evolving one as we spent literally hours upon it in meeting and in correspondence, in subsequent later discussions, and as we have arrived here. This difficulty stems out of a number of factors.

At the outset, the problem of professional relationships is a complex one. I suppose that there has been far too little thought and discussion on professional relationships. Certainly, I think that we can make this comment about ourselves, as we recognized last year that this was an important area to be studied.

I have not become aware of any extensive consideration in other organizations of the kind that we are going to talk about tonight.

Secondly, the difficulty stems out of an unprecedented activity in the student personnel field. As long as I can remember there has never been a period in which there has been more discussion and, I might say, more action in the personnel field than the one we are currently dealing with. I believe that makes the

problem of any group that is trying to work at clarification in this area more difficult.

The third thing, I think, is a difficulty that is self-imposed on the part of all of us. It stems out of our personal relationships and reactions to a group which has come to mean a great deal to us personally, the kinds of relationships that we have, the kinds of profits that we have gotten from our relationships and association. The fact of the matter is that we subjectivise this kind of thinking and in light of the other two difficulties of which I have spoken our need is for objectivising.

So I trust in the presentation of this report that you will have a feeling of the difficulty which has confronted us, and a conviction that we have tried our very best to objectivise our discussion in terms of the very important situations that are confronting us, because I think as we have a regard for and affection for something that is of value to us in the structure of an organization or a group of individuals, that it is tremendously important that we exercise that kind of objective discussion, objective thinking, which will work in the best interests of that which we feel is important.

The inspiration for, and charge of, responsibility to this Commission had its origin in the challenging address of the then President of this Association, Wesley Lloyd, at the 1951 meeting of this body in St. Louis, Missouri.

You will recall that the burden of President Lloyd's address was to the point that this Association was at the cross-roads of decision either to continue perhaps haphazardly within professional organizational struggle for leadership identification within the student personnel field, or forthrightly to meet the leadership call through frontal assault upon the challenges which lay before us.

The subsequent deliberations and actions of this body gave rise to a unanimous vote to expand our constitutionally listed organizational purposes to include, in part, the following statement: "The institutions, which are the constituent members of this Association, are represented by those who are primarily concerned with the administration of student personnel programs in colleges and universities of the United States. Recognizing that many specialized abilities contribute to meeting student needs, this Association seeks to provide and stimulate leadership for the effective combination and utilization of all of these (student personnel) resources."

This broadening of our stated constitutional purposes was also enacted out of realization that the student personnel field had evolved a number of special emphases and interests, all intrinsically and separately of great value and moment, though at times separately and at times in partial collectivism attempting to secure a position of primary recognition and consequence in student personnel endeavor. It was recognized that those who wore the mantle of administrative leadership and responsibility on campus could not logically default leadership responsibility in wider professional circles as basic problems of student personnel program operation were at issue.

The broadening of our organizational purposes further gave emphasis to our long time dedication to dealing with the whole personality of the individual. The challenge we are meeting is for a responsible leadership force which recognizes the unique contribution of personnel specialties; the administrative imperatives of the philosophy of wholism in dealing with the individual personality; and the problems of effective administrative application of student personnel resources to individual students and groups of students on campus within the framework of institutional philosophy and individuality.

This Association charted its new course further in the changing of the name of this Association to that of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. Over a period of time it has become apparent that our Association and convention constituency increasingly numbered those who carried directing and supervisory responsibility for student personnel programs. The name change was a recognition that there needed to be an organization primarily dedicated to problems of administration, leadership, and program development among those who institutionally carried primary responsibility for the successful operation of the student personnel program, and that the organization be so identified.

It was recognized, however, that the action of our Association was primarily a revised declaration of intent and purposes and that there needed to be an implementation of thinking as to direction and form of its activities which would enable this Association to fulfill its added responsibility.

Corollary action by our Association established five commissions to study and report on phases of Association interest, which it was felt would allow us, in deliberate and studied fashion, to assume our greater function.

To this Commission was delegated the responsibility to study and recommend the liaison relationships of our Association

with other agencies, groups, and offices concerned with the advancement of education and in particular student personnel work; to seek ways and means of encouraging the work of informal and formal gatherings of our members on a city, state and regional basis; and encourage the communications techniques of these groups with each other and our association in reporting their activities and interests.

Your Commission twice met in extended session in Chicago to develop the assignment which was given them, and further amplified its work through the medium of correspondence among its members to arrive at its report to you. It further met in joint session with your executive board to review with it the implications of its analyses, in order that its thinking might not be at variance with official interpretation of its functions.

In analyzing the liaison relationships which your Commission was charged to explore, it was concluded that the following needed perforce to be included:

- (a) Relationships to other organizations and groups working in the student personnel field.
- (b) Relationships to certain other professional, educational organizations relating generally to administrative concern in the field of higher education.
- (c) Relationships to offices and agencies related to higher education.

In working with this analysis your Commission observed the following:

- 1. Organizations relating to the student personnel field are many and present a confused picture with much overlapping of interest, membership and attendance.
- 2. Recent efforts of integration, merging and combining of student personnel groups have, because of inherent peculiarities of groups, tended to confuse rather than clarify the situation, in the minds of many.
- 3. Many existing professional organizations in the field generally do not have clearly defined functions, scope and delineation of interests. New organizations are appearing and adding to this confusion.
- 4. Groups apparently founded on the basis of specialized interests, or as associations of specialists, appear to tend

towards generalization, covering greater areas of student personnel concern and including greater emphasis on general administrative and directional concerns.

It became apparent to your Commission as it engaged in its analysis, that its work, and indeed the work of this Association, could not become effective until first we would clarify the nature and scope of our organization's purpose, membership and area of activity.

The following observations then dictated the further deliberations and conclusions of your Commission regarding our own Association:

1. The shift in the name from N.A.D.A.M. to N.A.S.P.A. was a fundamental change in the future course of the organization.
2. Implicit in the change is the concentration of concern upon the top administrative problems in student personnel work.
3. Implicit also is the continuing interest of top administrators in specialized program developments within the student personnel field.
4. The shift in name and emphasis at present finds the Association without adequate implementing, crystalized thought on the new manner of operation for the organization.
5. N.A.S.P.A. will become effective in its larger field of operation:
 - (a) as it develops out, in an evolutionary manner, its unique field of operation by definitively meeting the questions concerning it which will inevitably arise from its membership and others.
 - (b) as it continues to define its relationships to other professional associations in the student personnel field.
 - (c) as it, through programming, in addition to the impact on its members, establishes itself and has rapport with organizations whose memberships are primarily composed of college and university presidents, and deans who policy-wise determine the nature of student personnel work on the local campuses.

The remainder of this report, then, will deal with observations which your Commission has arrived at in its study, and

with such conclusions as we believe will, at this time, assist in clarifying the position of this Association, both to itself, to other professional organizations, and to those who administer the institutions of higher learning in our nation.

I. This Commission agrees that the new name, "The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators" and the enlargement of our organizational purposes places emphasis on its role as an organization of "principal administrators" of student personnel work on a national basis. The action of our Association last year places on the organization the responsibility to accept such "principal administrators" in student personnel work as institutions may designate.

A. In the judgment of your Commission, if we are to be consistent with the implications of our new name and the enlargement of our purposes, we must be prepared to receive as representative members to our Association, should they so desire:

- (a) Men or women who, by title and/or function, are the "principal administrators" of the institutional student personnel program (co-educational schools). This includes by title: Deans, Directors, Vice Presidents, etc.
- (b) "Principal administrators" in student personnel work in exclusively men's or women's colleges, regardless of the sex of the administrator.
- (c) Associate deans or directors in such schools where there is an intended shared "principal responsibility."
- (d) Deans or directors of colleges, regardless of sex, wherein the dean or director is at once the chief academic officer, as well as the "principal" student personnel officer operationally.

Your Commission accepted the following premises for its thinking in arriving at the foregoing statement:

- (1) N.A.S.P.A. and its predecessor N.A.D.A.M. have always constitutionally specified "institutional" membership, not "individual" membership. In other words, we have always been an association comprised of institutions wherein the people who have joined with us in these meetings were considered institutional representatives. N.A.S.P.A. then should be prepared

to receive "principal" administrators designated by institutions, regardless of sex or title.

- (2) N.A.S.P.A. must recognize that student personnel programs exist in colleges which are not coeducational, whether those be men's colleges or women's colleges.
- (3) N.A.S.P.A. must recognize that women, as well as men, can and do compete for "principal" positions in student personnel administration, if qualifications do not include limitation of sex.

B. A number of implications arise out of this general point under discussion:

- (a) It is obvious that the changes already wrought by the Association, together with the foregoing thinking, move the organization from an essentially small organization to a larger one. This is a fact, however, no different in the mind of your Commission, than had our predecessor organization, through popularity, been confronted with a surge of membership applications from the vast number of institutions which could have made application to join our ranks. We believe that sufficient originality and resourcefulness is contained within our ranks to have met such a situation.
- (b) Under the new conditions, however, as institutional members increase, there is no doubt that there may be need for a limitation of guest attendances in order to prevent such meetings from becoming unwieldy. Your Commission does not envisage this becoming immediately a serious problem.
- (c) There is, however, a continuing need for the kind of creativeness in program planning which will, to the utmost, preserve small group discussions, division by type of institution, to the end that each participant will continue to benefit from the personal outcomes which we have so much valued in the past. We believe that the tradition in program planning, which has served us so well in the past, can be continued and enlarged to the point that our concern about the matter need not be unduly magnified.

II. In this period of a surge to consolidation and merger which has characterized many professional areas, including student

personnel work, your Commission is agreed that this Association should not merge with any other organization at this time. This conclusion is borne out of a recognition of the uniqueness of the area of concern which is ours, together with our belief that we have not attained the potential of effectiveness in the enlarged area which we have prescribed for ourselves.

III. The action of this Association in charting an individualistic course, apart from the current efforts of consolidation and merger on a national level, calls, we believe, for a statement concerning our relationships to specialist groups.

Your Commission concludes that there always will be, and probably should be, an array of "specialist" organizations related to the student personnel field. While we note with sympathetic understanding efforts of consolidation and merger to effect an answer to a void in communication which has been and always will be a weakness in dealing with complex differentiation of work, it is our judgment that the sheer weight of organizational superstructure will at best result in an unwieldy pattern, diffusion of interest, and perhaps a later subsequent redivision of interests.

It is the conviction of your Commission that consolidation and integration of student personnel interests are best effected through administrative leadership and close cooperative working relationships on the local campus, and that this emphasis needs be a continuing one to which this organization should consistently address itself in the interest of finding new techniques and devices to best serve our students. Our belief, however, is not to be construed as saying that merit does not exist in the efforts to think together professionally on a national level. It is solely a matter of emphasis in relation to the time, opportunities, and relative effectiveness of such effort.

- A. In relation to the immediately foregoing statements, your Commission advances the following suggestions for emphasis in operation of this Association:
- (a) We should encourage our specialist staff members to become active in professional specialist organizations, and encourage them to seek ideas and devices for more effective, close working relationships on the local campus.
 - (b) Communication devices of N.A.S.P.A. should attempt to bring to the foreground of N.A.S.P.A. consideration a reporting of significant developments in the specialist fields.

- (c) A certain degree of integration can be effected by inviting key leaders from "specialist" organizations to participate in program capacities at N.A.S.P.A. meetings.
- (d) There will continue to arise problems and concerns on general student personnel and other related educational matters, wherein the cooperation with specialist organizations is desirable and necessary. N.A.S.P.A., through its duly constituted officers, should ever remain alert to these contingencies.

IV. Your Commission has studied the array of informal groupings of Deans of Men, Deans of Students, and others on a local, state, regional, and area basis. Over the years it has appeared to some that they were in a manner loosely related to N.A.D.A.M. Upon close examination, no organizational affiliation can be found. These groups are, in essence, spontaneous extensions of interest generated at national conferences; or exist for the need of communication in their several vicinities; for professional improvement programs, or for the purpose of meeting special problems.

- A. It is noted that the new direction in which N.A.S.P.A. is moving will materially change the small, intimate association of past national meetings. However, this phenomenon is not restricted alone to N.A.S.P.A. This trend among all national groups accentuates the importance of the smaller geographic groupings here under discussion.
- B. We think these groups are important for the purpose of:
 - (a) obtaining "grass roots" thinking and planning to be passed up to the national level;
 - (b) for implementation of communication from the national level to the local campus;
 - (c) for reaching institutions which, by their nature, will not be represented at national meetings;
 - (d) for providing a means of retaining the casual informality which is inherent in small organizations, but is easily lost in larger associations.
- C. It is our judgment that these groups should retain their independence, autonomy, and spontaneity, and that no attempt should be made to organize a superstructure where these groups would organizationally be tied in with N.A.S.P.A.

D. It is important, however, that through the N.A.S.P.A. newsletter, as has been so ably done in the past, we have a channel of communication which keeps us informed of their activities and concerns on an informal reporting basis.

V. The Commission recognizes that there are a number of professional organizations about whose activities N.A.S.P.A. ought to be informed as they deal with student personnel matters, and with whom we should, where feasible, cooperate. It is recognized that some organizations, though ostensibly not designed to be concerned with student personnel work, actually are intimately involved as their members function on the local campus. Within the broad area of student personnel concerns there appear a number of organizations, some closely related; others related by function of members apart from stated organizational purposes, and some functioning on the periphery of the student personnel field.

The problem of the extent to which N.A.S.P.A. should work with these organizations and how best this might be done, we believe, should be a continuing concern of future commissions on professional relationships.

Your Commission has thus far in its analysis fashioned five groupings of such organizations, and makes comments concerning each grouping:

Group I

Organizations with which N.A.S.P.A. as an organization may cooperate on a policy-making, study, or research basis, particularly on administrative aspects of student personnel work:

U. S. Office of Education
American Council on Education
National Education Association

Group II

Organizations with which N.A.S.P.A. should have a cooperative working relationship and encourage the incorporation of the student personnel administration concerns into their programming. N.A.S.P.A. may well establish a core of administrative resource people who would be available for program participation.

Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities
Association of Urban Universities
Association of American Colleges
Association of American Universities
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Regional Accrediting Agencies.

Group III

Organizations more specialized in function but with whom a relationship should exist parallel to that indicated for Group II. It may be noted with special reference to the Business Officers Association that their interests are frequently enmeshed administratively on the local campus with direct participation in some student personnel concerns.

American Conference of Academic Deans
 American Public Relations Association
 Regional College and University Business Officers Association

Group IV

Organizations of a specialist or combined specialist nature in which the following emphases may be developed:

- (a) encouraging and assisting in the interchange of information on organizational concerns and programming activities;
- (b) interchange of key personnel in program participation;
- (c) cooperation in projects which cut across specialty lines and are of larger concern to student personnel work;
- (d) encouragement of our staff personnel to participate in and attend programs of specialty groups;
- (e) assist our staff members in advancing their specialty interests and projects on the local campus.

Your Commission recognizes that much more extended study will need be given by future commissions on the most profitable relationships which can be established and maintained with these groups:

National Association of Foreign Student Advisers
 American College Personnel Association
 National Association of Deans of Women
 National Vocational Guidance Association
 American Orthopsychiatric Association
 Personnel and Guidance Association
 American College Health Association
 Association of College Unions
 American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers
 Orientation Week Directors
 Midwest Placement Officers
 Housing and Dormitory Directors.

Group V

Organizations whose membership is predominantly students and graduates, with whom communication on the national level may be furthered by N.A.S.P.A. liaison groups to explore communication and working relationships:

National Student Association
 National Independent Student Association
 National Interfraternity Conference
 National Panhellenic Conference
 Student religious groups and foundations
 National Association of College Honor Societies.

Your Commission recognizes that this is a lengthy report. At the same time it is our feeling that the work on this this commission area has just been begun. It is our feeling that the items of concern which the Commission has singled out are among those about which the ultimate future successful operation of this Association hinges. We cannot too strongly endorse the further immediate, vigorous study of this area.

In presenting this report to you for Convention action, your Commission feels that this Association is yet faced with crossroads decisions, upon which we have but taken initial action. The report which we present to you seems to us to outline a further logical course which, in its component parts, will need be implemented by Convention action to further our progress for another year. We do believe there is an urgency in taking action on those parts of this report where definitive action can be taken, in order that we may keep abreast of developments in the student personnel field.

I might say in closing that while this is a lengthy report, we have attempted to provide for you a summary of the issues on a page or two, about which you can center your discussion, which in essence are the critical points which your Commission advances to you for your consideration. Thank you very much. [Applause]

PRESIDENT KNAPP: May we have some help in the distribution of these dockets? I understand from Vic there are two things being distributed, the full report and a two-page summary. The two-page summary indicates the material which in the judgment of the Commission will probably engage us this evening. Mr. Gardner has reminded me that there is a typographical error in the first line of the summary, "It is the recommendation of your commission that out" should read "our".

... The dockets were distributed ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: For the sake of clarification, as I look at this summary very briefly -- and we may change our minds collectively as we go along -- it would appear to me that our problem is a matter of discussion of these recommendations and an indication perhaps of whether or not we approve the general line of thought, because, in particular, in #I there is no need to change anything about our membership. This is a membership of institutions and our constitution does not need to be changed in any particular to encompass everything that is in #I. It has already been done. Let's confine our discussion to these I, II, III, IV, V, in order.

It seems to me that the question is: Are you in general agreement with your Commission that the implications of action taken a year ago involve considerations in No. I. Is that a fair statement?

DEAN SPATHELF: Yes, I think so.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Does anyone want to dispute my constitutional ruling at this point? We are not faced with a change in our constitution at all; we are a membership association of institutions. The people who come here are designated by the institutional heads.

Your Commission has listed here some of the things that can happen to us as a result of our present constitutional setup. The floor is open for discussion on No. I.

DEAN GEARY EPPLEY (University of Maryland): I am not clear. You say "Principal administrators of student personnel work". What about the assistants? Are they still welcome to the meetings or not? I am not clear on that.

DEAN SPATHELF: It seems to me that your definition of "principal" includes those who share major responsibility. Your Commission was faced with a problem in semantics here of how to phrase this thing to get this thing clear, and it hit upon the phrase "principal administrators". They are the people who have primary administrative responsibility. As you read this elaboration here, you will find that in the thinking of your Commission that this embraces people who have a responsible capacity or where there is shared responsibility. Certainly I know as far as my own organization is concerned I operate with the idea that "principal assistants" have a shared responsibility in this kind of work. I would see no limitation on the basis of the Commission's interpretation of your question.

I hope here that the rest of the Commission members will help, and Arno has just raised his hand.

DEAN HAACK: I think it might help to point this out. In the thinking of the Commission we distinguished between membership concept and attendance at professional meetings. This paragraph here refers to the membership concept, and that is not a change at all in anything that we have stood for up until now. The question of the bringing of multiple staff members to Conferences is a matter at the discretion of the Association. We can be free on that, or restrictive if we need to, but that is not covered by this section of the report.

DEAN SPATHELF: I think the later comment in the report, that should we develop an increasing institutional membership that we may have to face the issue in the future of how many guests or multiple representations we can have at Conferences covers that. This is purely your judgment collectively of how we can best work, but that is not implicit in the limitation.

DEAN R. W. BISHOP (University of Cincinnati): Item "c", why wouldn't it be well to put "assistant administrators" there? Do you have a special reason for using the terms "Associate Deans or Directors"? Wouldn't that take care of the questions that have been raised?

DEAN SPATHELF: I think this could be so edited. Certainly the thinking of your Commission did not outlaw this.

DEAN BALDWIN: This was my understanding of what the organization was. You say "men's and women's colleges, regardless of the sex." There was no question of it before. It was male. Now you say "regardless of the sex" but you say it was not changed. It seems like it is to me.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Ted, you are way behind. We knew that a year ago, did we not, when we said that this was going to be a National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. We are an institutional membership, and I as president of my little college could send a lady as my chief personnel officer. Under our constitution she cannot be denied. There is no difference in that. We did that a year ago, and openly. Three questions were asked from the floor about that a year ago and answered very specifically. Was there anybody under any hallucinations about that? I don't think so. My comment last night was directed to that point.

DEAN BALDWIN: How many were in doubt?

PRESIDENT KNAPP: How many were in doubt that what we did last year removed any possibility of a constitutional restriction on females attending this organization? [A few raised their hands] Were you here? All those who were here, please. [Two raised their hands] We had questions from the floor on that. This is an institutional membership and has always been so. The previous name, however, implied that; and we changed the name. The question was raised at the time, "What does this do about women?"

I am a little bit confused about this recommendation, because it looks to me like we are dealing with Commission thinking. It does not require constitutional change, and actually does not require any action because unless we want to make the constitution more specific it presently reads that institutions are the members, the implication being that the head of that institution can send to a student personnel administrator meeting whom he wishes to send. Up to the present time he could send as many as he wishes to send.

DEAN SPATHELF: I think there needs to be a point of clarification here, Blair.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: I need it too.

DEAN SPATHELF: I think that is confusing. Our organizational constitution has always implied institutional membership. The dilemma we were faced with was that our name over the years, following its origin, placed a limitation thereon. This limitation was removed in the change of the name, per se, but the larger issue is the organizational issue of whether or not this organization is going to meet up to what we think our responsibilities are for leadership in the student personnel field.

On this basis it is important that we clarify, in light of our past history, and in light of our action of last year, how we are going to meet that leadership challenge. Therefore, this initial statement makes this very clear. The fact of the matter is that this is not clear on a national basis at all. The fact of the matter is that within the last several days I have had the privilege of visiting the campuses of a couple of institutions and when I told them I was enroute to this organization they did not know what this organization really was. Both institutional presidents confessed at this particular point that they did not know that there was any clarification existing in

any of the student personnel fields which would bring into focus that which your Commission is trying to bring into focus here tonight. It is one of the confused pictures in the national scene.

This is in reality a clarification of our acceptance of a leadership responsibility in the field. It transcends the media that you asked.

DEAN T. J. THOMPSON (University of Nebraska): If you go to page 4 I think that will clarify that. I think that what you are worrying about is cleared up there. It is set out here. In this summary there are no complete sentences and the thing is not clear.

DEAN SMITH: I think the first difficulty may be the first sentence of the report.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: This is an error and your chairman is going to have to take the responsibility for this.

DEAN SMITH: Institutions are members. It is a matter of attendance policies, or representation policies.

DEAN STROZIER: I do think there is some little confusion that results from the Commission report, from the statement which you have just made. While it is true that by our constitution any institution may be a member and may send anyone they wish, who is in the executive position, no women administrators have been sent, and the name of the institution in the past has limited it to men. So I do not think we could just assume that immediately women might be sent without any rather full discussion on the floor.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: That is a good point, Bob. Would you extend it further to a discussion of any other points in No. I?

DEAN STROZIER: No. It seems to me that the approach that Vic has made here, recommending that this really be the policy, is still subject to the discussion of the group rather than the assumption that this is already an accomplished fact.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: That is a good point. Constitutionally it is an accomplished fact; public relationwise it has not been accepted. Does that summarize your point?

SECRETARY TURNER: To clear the other point on how many people may attend, our constitution states, in Section 5, "member

institutions shall be entitled to one vote at the national meetings but may send as many delegates as it wishes."

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Your chairman is a little in a quandary as to how we shall proceed here. I have seen this summary for the first time, as you have, and the Commission has sought to clarify here, and has done a tremendous amount of work. We want to move it along. The question is for us to decide how far we want to go, I think, at this meeting. Let's get at it this way.

Is there disagreement that any person so named would not be entirely entitled to attend a meeting of this Association, if designated by their institution? We have to nail these things down. We have another Commission coming up. I am saying to you, is there disagreement that any one named in No. I is not properly present among us as a representative of a member institution?

DEAN MATTHEWS: As I understand this, at the present time, if Lindenwood College a month ago had requested membership in this organization they could have had membership.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: If they could conform to our membership qualifications.

DEAN MATTHEWS: Which are what?

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Essentially being accredited by the proper degree granting agency.

DEAN MATTHEWS: Therefore the president of that institution, once that organization had been accepted, could have sent to this meeting under its present constitution five people, all of whom could have been women?

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Exactly.

DEAN MATTHEWS: And only one of them could have voted?

PRESIDENT KNAPP: That is right.

DEAN MATTHEWS: That is the exact situation with which we are faced today. That is already a matter of record.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Correct.

DEAN MATTHEWS: So it seems to me there is a little confusion, as there was -- really more than two hands went up a little while ago -- on that St. Louis deal, I believe. But it seems to me this is just an implementation of this report here.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Bob Strozier's point is that even though what you have said is true, and has been true, the fact of the matter is that as we move along gradually to implement what we did a year ago, we have got to spell out in terms of public relations just what we mean. Isn't that what you said, Bob, in a sense?

DEAN STROZIER: Essentially so, yes.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Vic, am I right that is what you attempted to do in No. I?

DEAN SPATHELF: I think if it is in order, Mr. President, it may be in order to move that this statement referring to No. I be accepted or adopted in principle, as an interpretation of our present position. I so move.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: The Chair has heard a motion and a second, indicating that the recommendations in No. I, a, b, c and d be adopted in principle -- not the latter one in terms of a motion being referred. Is there discussion?

DEAN BISHOP: That would include some editing there to smooth this out?

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Definitely. In principle -- I think this goes back to what I stated a moment ago, that we are in general agreement that the persons named herein would be appropriate representatives of their institutions in this meeting. Would that be acceptable as an interpretation of what we are saying?

DEAN SPATHELF: Yes.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Does "in principle" mean that this is an exclusive list? I think we had better clarify that before we vote.

DEAN SPATHELF: There was a supplemental suggestion here from Dean Bishop, to include on "c" "Assistant Deans".

PRESIDENT KNAPP: As chairman of the Commission, would you be willing to accept that the motion should read --

DEAN BISHOP: I said "assistant administrators" in order to be inclusive.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: I am trying to be a little more broad here and a little less final. If the maker of the motion and the seconder would agree that we are adopting "a", "b", "c" and "d" in principle, with the understanding that it is not exclusive -- will the maker of the motion accept that?

DEAN SPATHELF: Yes.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Is that all right with the seconder of the motion? All right.

DEAN T. J. THOMPSON: Are we voting on the summary or the main report?

PRESIDENT KNAPP: You are voting on the summary at this time.

DEAN T. J. THOMPSON: I would like to move that we substitute the approval of the main report, part 1.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: The chairman hears a substitute motion that we vote an approval of the main report No. 1. Will you please refer to it. In principle or in verbatim, sir?

DEAN THOMPSON: Verbatim. Mr. Chairman, I think that is the only place you can get a clear statement of what is intended.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Your point is that it is a better statement than the summary?

DEAN THOMPSON: That is right. That is what you are doing.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: All right, we have a motion to substitute the adoption of the report verbatim.

SECRETARY TURNER: I rise to a point of order there. Did Dean Thompson mean all of "I" or does he mean "1 a"?

PRESIDENT KNAPP: He said all of "I".

SECRETARY TURNER: Do you want Roman I, section "a"?

DEAN THOMPSON: The whole thing, clear down to II, where you are talking about mergers.

SECRETARY TURNER: That is all of page 4 and half of 5.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: The substitute motion is to adopt the recommendation of the Commission No. I inclusive and verbatim, as it appears on page 4 and the upper part of page 5. Is there discussion on the substitute motion?

DEAN EPPLEY: Would it be advisable to postpone voting on this until the morning, and have the discussion tonight? In other words, people are voting on something they have not had a chance to study.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: You are the doctors. We have some other Commissions to listen to.

DEAN ROBERT E. THORN (Grove City College): I wish Vic would give us an idea of why the immediacy of this. Why must we go ahead and vote right now? Why the hurry?

DEAN SPATHELF: There is no implication of that at all.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: He didn't imply that at all.

DEAN MATTHEWS: I move the motion be tabled.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: You are going to get me snarled up parliamentarywise before I am through. [Laughter] I am going to shortcut it, as I'm trying to get my kids to do. Is there objection to postponing this until further meeting?

... Cries of "No" ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: All right, it is so ordered. That is a lot better than voting on substitute motions.

I may be wrong in my interpretation of what we are trying to do here, but I would like to have your consideration, if I may, of this. As you consider the summary and the total report, bear in mind that our vote indicates a general acceptance of principle, on a non-exclusive basis. It is not an amendment to the constitution. It will simply serve as a kind of guidance to the Commission for next year, and a clarification for some of the folks on the outside who do not know what goes.

If anybody objects to my interpretation of what our vote means, when I take it, say so now. This is not binding us

constitutionally or any other way, as I understand it.

DEAN STROZIER: I don't know what we are voting on. We have a motion, a substitute motion, and a motion to table. What are we tabling, or where are we? I really don't know.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: We are not voting on anything. May I restate it. We agreed by consensus to postpone the vote. The Chair asked permission to clarify what we are voting on when we do vote on it on a postponed basis, and I suggested we are not voting on a constitutional amendment, but we are indicating an attitude and approval of a Commission determination which would be for the guidance of next year's commission and for the public relations with outsiders. Am I clear?

... Cries of "No" ...

VOICE: Call for the question.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: There is no question. I am going to restate it once more, and then I am going to ask Bob Strozier to take the Chair. By consensus we agreed to postpone the vote on this matter. We are not going to vote on it tonight.

I asked you, in considering, as you read it tonight in preparation for a vote tomorrow or Saturday morning, or whenever we do it, that we are not voting on a constitutional change, but your vote yes or no is simply an indication of general approval of the Commission's thinking for the guidance of next year's commission and for the guidance of outsiders who want to know what we are trying to work out here gradually. Is that clear?

... Cries of "Yes" and "No" [Laughter] ...

DEAN T. J. THOMPSON: I rise to a point of order. I think we ought to use regular Robert's Rules of procedures and do this thing right. As a matter of fact, I have great confidence in this Commission and I think it is high time we did away with this thing and got on to adopting No. I. I therefore call for a vote on No. I and move again for a substitute motion on No. I.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: I am sorry, sir. By consensus we canceled out all the motions. You are privileged to make a new motion if you wish.

DEAN THOMPSON: I rise to a point of order. I do not think you have that consensus.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: The Chair so rules. Am I supported by the Convention? [Cries of "Yes"] All those in favor of supporting the Chair's ruling that we washed out about five motions and amendments that would have tied us up for fifteen minutes and have cleared the desk, say "aye." Opposed. The motion is adopted and we have no motions before us. You are privileged to make one. Mr. Thompson, do you wish to make a motion?

DEAN THOMPSON: I move that we adopt section I, and I do that because I have great confidence in this Commission and what they have done. I think you might as well get on with this thing and get it over.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Section I of the total report, verbatim. Is there a second?

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: The motion has been made and seconded that we adopt Section I of the report. Is there any further discussion?

DEAN BISHOP: I object to the verbatim, if we include adding one or two points there.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: This is the main report we are talking on.

DEAN STONE: I move to table.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: The motion has been made to table. Is there a second to the motion?

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: The motion has been made to table. All those in favor signify by the usual sign. Opposed. The motion to table is carried.

The remarks that I made a few moments ago about when we do vote on it, I think, are pertinent and not out of order.

DEAN GEORGE E. DAVIS (Purdue University): How do we determine who votes in here? I thought the constitution said that each institution had one vote.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Any member of this Convention who wishes to challenge the attitude of this convention on any motion has the privilege of demanding a roll call of institutions, and each institution has one vote.

DEAN DAVIS: I haven't the slightest intention of demanding any such roll call, but if the constitution says that is the way to vote, why don't we do it that way? [Laughter]

PRESIDENT KNAPP: May the Chair make a further statement, please? I am perfectly willing to relinquish this Chair to anybody who wants to do this job. This is an extremely difficult thing. We have great divergence of opinion on many of these points. We have four more Commissions to listen to. I do not care whether we adopt a single one of these provisions. There is no need for haste, but I do not like to see us get tied up in some nonsense of parliamentary law. If there is a close division this Chair will insist upon an institutional vote. If the vote is overwhelming, he thinks it is ridiculous to so insist.

DEAN WILLIAM S. GUTHRIE (Ohio State University): Could I suggest that in the votes that each institution, or representative group have an understanding that one vote should apply, then we would not have a roll call, but there will be only one sound vote.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: That makes sense to me. Let's try to do that, and in the case of a close vote we will have a roll call.

There is no urgency here. If you do not adopt any of this thing, that is perfectly all right as far as I am concerned. So let's not get excited about parliamentary law. Do you want to consider No. II, or do you want to postpone consideration of the whole report? Do I hear a motion? Do you want to make a motion?

DEAN SPATHELF: Mr. Chairman, I move that Item II of the Commission report be adopted in principle as the statement of the organization.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Is there a second to that motion?

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Is there discussion? Are you ready for a vote?

... The question was called for ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: All those in favor signify by the usual sign. Opposed. The motion is adopted.

DEAN SPATHELF: Mr. Chairman, I move that Roman numeral

No. III be accepted as the statement of principle of the attitude of the Association.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Let's take a little time until we have a chance to read No. III, then I will entertain a second. We are working on the summary here now.

... Cries of "No" ...

DEAN SPATHELF: This is the major report, page 5.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: I am sorry. Now you have me confused. Major report, page 5, No. III. If you have finished your reading, I will entertain a second.

DEAN HAACK: I second the motion.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: We are dealing with Roman numeral III that starts on page 5 and runs over through half of page 6, on the complete report. The motion is that it be adopted in principle as the feeling of this Association. We have a second. Is there discussion?

... The question was called for ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Those in favor signify by the usual sign. Opposed. The motion is adopted.

DEAN SPATHELF: I now move that Roman numeral IV, on page 6 of the major report be adopted as the statement of clarification of our relationships to the various formal and informal groups of Deans of Men, Deans of Students, and others on a local, state, regional and area basis.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: The motion has been made and seconded that Roman numeral IV, beginning at the top of page 6 and running to page 7, shall be adopted as a statement of principle of this organization.

DEAN SHUTT: I see the word N.A.D.A.M. Did you mean N.A.D.A.M. or did you mean N.A.S.P.A. at that point?

DEAN SPATHELF: I meant N.A.D.A.M. at that time, because this is where the concept had developed. In fact, some of these groupings on that area took the name, Association of Deans and Advisers of Men on a regional basis. This is a past tense statement, that they were, in a manner, loosely related to

N.A.D.A.M. This now relates to item "c" below, which states that as far as N.A.S.P.A. is concerned they should not be organizationally tied into N.A.S.P.A. This was a historical statement as far as the reference to N.A.D.A.M. is concerned.

DEAN SHUTT: Thank you.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Any further questions or discussion? Are you ready for a vote?

... The question was called for ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: All those in favor signify by the usual sign. Opposed. The motion is adopted.

DEAN SPATHELF: I move that Roman numeral V on page u be accepted as a progress report, and a charge to the future commission on professional relationships.

DEAN HAACK: I second the motion.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: It is moved and seconded that Roman numeral V, beginning on page 7 and running through page 9, shall be adopted for the guidance of future commissions on professional relationships. Is there discussion?

... The question was called for ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: All those in favor signify by the usual sign. Opposed. The motion is adopted.

I think it is quite clear to all of us that the Commission report was accepted without opposition, and most of it from a bulk point of view. We are concerned with the clarification of what is intended in No. I, particularly as it has been summarized. If I understand the sense of this Conference, you would like to have, perhaps, the chairman of this Commission prepare a clarifying statement before we vote on this matter. Have I interpreted your feeling in this regard? Yes or no? [Cries of "Yes"] I think that is the story.

DEAN SPATHELF: May I ask a point of information at this point?

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Surely.

DEAN SPATHELF: I would judge from the discussion that took place that the question that is of concern to the several

who raised the question, relates on page 4 of the major report to the insertion in item "c" of the additional clarification that would provide for assistant principal administrators, or assistant deans. Am I correct in this assumption?

DEAN BISHOP: Administrators was the word.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: That would be small letters.

DEAN SPATHELF: Small letters. Is my understanding on this matter correct? To the individual who moved to table, is this the primary concern here at this point, or are there other concerns?

DEAN STONE: It is my feeling, Mr. Chairman, that the membership would like to have time to read this document before voting on it.

DEAN SPATHELF: Okay.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Would you keep in mind, Vic, if I interpret it correctly, I think the sense of this group is that it is not yet willing to make this an exclusive statement. If I were not here, I would certainly respond from the floor that while accepting this in principle as a statement of folks who certainly could come here representing their institutions I would not want it to be interpreted as an exclusive statement. Am I interpreting some of your thinking in that regard too, yes or no. [Cries of "Yes"] I think that needs to be considered.

DEAN MATTHEWS: I am sorry to speak once again.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: That is why we are having a meeting.

DEAN MATTHEWS: It seems to me that once we decide that an institution has membership, then it is up to the president of that institution to determine who shall attend the meetings, and in this "a" on page 4, it states, "In the judgment of your Commission, if we are to be consistent with the implications of our new name and the enlargement of our purposes, we must be prepared to receive as representative members to our Association, should they so desire" --- should they as individuals -- that is not the point, is it? That should be made clear it seems to me. Not "they" but "whomever the institution should decide to send," the man or woman.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: That is an excellent point, I think, and one we seemingly must reiterate so that it is clear. The

institution under our constitution has the sole prerogative of deciding who is going to come here. There is just no question about that. The only purpose of this section at all, as Dean Strozier pointed out, is to make it clear to the membership and to outsiders, persons whom in our judgment, in the light of our administrative orientation we conceived to be most acceptable. If the head of the institution wants to send fourteen different kinds of people, that is his prerogative. It is suggestive only and that is the only implication it can have, until you are ready to change your constitution. Let's not be in any confusion about that. We are entertaining here no constitutional change.

DEAN CLINTON B. GASS (Nebraska Wesleyan University): I remember when the discussion was before us regarding the change of name a couple of years ago, and again last year, and I was under the impression that the change was made to include the male deans of students who are usually in attendance, and I think in most of the discussion there was little said, if anything, about women attending when the change was considered.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: I think you are absolutely correct, up until last year. That is a personal judgment, and I am subject to correction. I think last year, for the first time, the subject of non-male representation was faced for the first time.

DEAN EPPLEY: When this information goes out to the president of some institution, some new president, and he has not been acquainted with the Association, is he going to understand this? That is the point. Suppose it is a school where they have a Dean of Men and a Dean of Women, both reporting to the President, who is the "principal administrator" there? Is it going to be clear to him now?

PRESIDENT KNAPP: I don't know whether the president will understand it or not, but the language of the report states they can both come. They would have one vote, but they are both representing the institution if the president sends them. They have one vote. That is the language of your report.

DEAN SPATHELF: My understanding is -- from your constitutional provisions -- that the institution has one vote. Your Commission was very much aware of the fact that there are divergent patterns of this kind of thing, and obviously we are, and probably will be for quite some time, in a state of transition on this whole matter. Therefore, it tried to word this to not be restrictive in the sense that it would tend to point only to one type of organization, which may be in one type of institution. I think this ought to be clear.

I think the other thing that ought to be clear is basic in our whole discussion last year, and it underlies the thinking of this Commission, because after all this is the basis upon which it operated. You will recall that President Lloyd made it very clear last year what our issue was as far as our relationship to the entire student personnel field was concerned. I think he made the alternatives rather clear, that if this Association did not wish to accept the leadership challenge which was before us in the whole field then we could continue to be the kind of organization that we had been; but with other developments as they are continuing in the personnel field, it would automatically, I think, set for us a relationship that perhaps later we would wonder what had happened.

Now, this was the sense of this thing last year, and the issue was straight before the Association as to whether we continue in the face of other developments, because actually we are not operating in a vacuum - whether we continue to remain as we were, or whether this organization was going to move forward and try on its best collective judgment to induce a kind of clarification so far as it could, by trying to accept responsibility which it thought it could accept and should accept at this particular time.

I think that is the substance of the entire Commission report, to further clarify and make substantially clear to those who have remembered us since 1919, in one stage of development or another, and who still have questions, or if not questions, ideas to the contrary. The attempt was to clarify this so that we would understand it, and so that we could make this clear to others.

On the other hand, the mere statement of this is only one step. We must demonstrate through the action of our Association, through our programming, through our other organizational activity, that we are equal to that which we have set for ourselves, and upon this basis we cannot legislate. We just have to let the sum total of public acceptance in the field judge whether we are adding up to that.

DEAN THOMPSON: When these are finally adopted, are they to become by-laws of this Association, or what will they become?

PRESIDENT KNAPP: No, sir. Let me repeat again. Each one that you have adopted thus far is a statement of approval in principle for the guidance of next year's Commission, for the guidance of the membership of this Association, and for those who are keeping an eye on what we are working toward. That is all their status is: Acceptance in principle.

DEAN THOMPSON: When they are adopted next year, will they become a part of the by-laws, or what will they become?

PRESIDENT KNAPP: No, sir. It depends on next year's convention to do with them what they will if they need to be adopted again. These are statements of acceptance of a policy which conform to the constitution. They do not need to be by-laws. You can amend your constitution if you want to, but your Commission has not proposed it.

DEAN SPATHELF: Can I inject something here?

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Yes, but briefly.

DEAN SPATHELF: Part of the problem is an interpretation. I think our interpretation of our action and intent and purpose is only recorded in our official record. This is transcribed here, and to those who raise questions in the future, this will stand as an interpretation of that which is officially in our organizational charter, if you will. I would like to emphasize that it is in the area of interpretation and a clarification of our organizational purposes and the direction in which we are going.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: We have adopted part of this report, and reserved for a later time consideration of the first part. Regardless of what you think of these Commission recommendations, I think it is only fair for us to indicate appreciation for the many, many hours that the members of this Commission, as listed in the back pages of your program, has put on this thing, and I suggest that we indicate that now. [Applause]

The Chair recognizes the Chairman of Commission II, Dean Newhouse, to present the report of Commission II.

DEAN DEAN S. NEWHOUSE (Case Institute of Technology; Chairman, Commission II): Gentlemen, the first report of Commission II, the Commission On Principles and Ethics, is in your hands. It is entitled "Statement of Principles." I presume by this time you have had an opportunity to scan it. I think some orientation to a thorough reading of it will be helpful. May I remind you that last year the Ohio Deans' group made the proposal that there be formulated a statement of principles and ethics for the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. That suggestion was adopted, was approved by the group, and the Commission was appointed by the Executive Committee. Commission II got under way right after the meeting last year. It kind of faltered through the spring and summer, as the full complement of members was being secured, then settled down to work in September.

The October meeting of the Ohio Deans group was given over to a discussion of a preliminary set of statements which the chairman supplied to them. Nearly everyone of my pet concepts got kicked out promptly. At that time we were primarily concerned with ethics; secondarily with principles. We learned in that first meeting how widely we actually differ in our notions of ethics, and how infinitely wide is our notion of how to state them. We decided, however, in that first meeting that any statement that we produced would be free of professional jargon because it was not designed only for student personnel persons to read, but for our other educational colleagues and perhaps some colleagues not even connected with education in our respective communities. We decided that our statement must be useful to us, the student personnel administrators, and also useful to our educational colleagues.

We discovered very quickly that the novel, the dramatic, the challenging ideas could not get agreement. We discovered that no person's favored words or language would suit the others; that many of the best words and phrases we knew were ambiguous, or meant something else to other persons. I think it is very possible that with only a quick scanning you will find some words in the statement of principles that do not suit you as well as some other words. I assure you that the words in that statement are not all the ones of my choice, or are not the first choice of any other member of the Commission either. They are compromises, and they are words which have been tested for ambiguity, or clarity.

This matter of words for a statement of principles is interesting. I would frankly challenge anyone here, even Ed Williamson or Bob Strozier, to come up with some words or phrases that the committee has not considered at sometime or another -- that is, if Bob will stick to the English language. [Laughter] We have been to Webster, we have been to Roget, and we have found that Roget was very, very helpful in supplying colorful, descriptive language, which we reluctantly decided not to use.

Just take the verbs in this Statement: Contributes, takes an active part in, promotes, seeks, helps, encourages, and so forth. Now they are pretty colorless, dull, run of the mine words. Roget gives synonyms which I like much better in describing the type of work I do and the type of work and situation which you have, I suspect. Let me read you a few of them: "Gird up one's loins, [laughter] buckle on one's armour, go through fire and water [laughter], get the steam up, get the wind up. [Laughter] For your counseling functions: Help a lame dog over a stile, improve the shining hour, watch and pray [laughter], tamper with, meddle, interfere, butt in, moil [laughter], cradle,

nourish, nurture, nurse, dry nurse, suckle. [Laughter] For leadership of students or faculty: drag a length of chain [laughter], beat up the recruits, put the horses to, stir one's stumps. [Laughter] For administration: be busy, work day and night, pander to, pay the piper, smile upon, get on the bandwagon, back up, [laughter] keep one's powder dry [laughter], have many irons in the fire, stick at nothing, go all lengths, elbow one's way, raise a dust, hustle. [Laughter]

We abandoned the idea of stating ethics, not because we could not find ethics, but because those on which we could agree were not significant. They were the ethics one would expect of educators anywhere, or of professional people anywhere.

By January, after a second meeting, we had compromised ourselves into a neat little package statement which some of you have seen, of principles and ethics. We were very dissatisfied with that statement, on two counts. You know Maurel Hunkins of Ohio University in Athens, we discovered, is quite a user of pungent language. He voiced our feeling about this very nicely. He said, "My one question about this is: Has the mountain labored and brought forth a mouse?"

Several of us verbalized the other question, was student personnel administration not yet a professional field capable of definition?

In desperation we sent the "mouse" to a list of some 85 critics picked for their diversity of viewpoint. They included not only some of you, as student personnel administrators but they included some of the specialists, some members of other professional organizations, they included some Deans of Women, some Deans of Colleges, some professors, some college Presidents. About 40 of the 85 responded, and those critics saved our project for us, I think. There were some caustic comments, which were hard to take, and there were some constructive friendly criticisms which were even harder to take, but because we had, in all honesty, to admit that those criticisms were justified, and perhaps because there was no alternative, we took them and we went to work again.

We called a hurry-up meeting in Akron. Five of us were able to be there, and we pooled the thinking of the critics and the thinking of the commission. Then, because time was short, we sent that revised statement to those few critics who had really criticized at some length, to see if we had satisfied them with the revision.

I grant there are some persons -- and there may be several of you here -- who never having seen that second

statement would have preferred the first one, and who gave your approval to the first one. Our reason for going ahead with the change was that it was our responsibility, as a Commission, to write it. We did not put in any idea of any critic just because it was suggested. We put in only those points, those concepts and those wordings that we believed in ourselves.

I would like to read some of the comments we got back from this small list of critics of the second statement, the ones who had really criticized the first one at some length. I think I had probably better not give you their names, but here are the way the statements run:

1) The revised statement is excellent. 2) I think your statement is good. 3) I regard this as a satisfactory statement. It contains most of the essential things. 4) This is much better. I still don't think it makes my point enough to suit me ... 5) This is a helpful statement ... I would prefer a shorter, less involved statement ... Sometimes I think that personnel administration, as a professional field, is not yet ready to define itself. 6) I like this statement very much. 7) I like the doing emphases in this statement and find nothing with which I disagree. 8) I should certainly endorse it as it stands with the exception of the final paragraph." 9) This is a substantial statement. It is an 'identifying' statement and applies to student personnel people uniquely -- and that is important. 10) The revised statement of NASPA's 'Principles' is excellent. I have kept the copy to show my Dean what I should be doing! 11) I'm very pleased with this statement of principles... 12) We have had a tendency to qualify or explain too much ... but in general ... an exceedingly fine piece of work.

Then again one from Maurel Hunkins at Ohio which, because of its pungent wording I will give his name. Some of you may know that the head of the English Department at the Ohio University is Ted Hodnett. Here is what Maurel writes:

"Ted Hodnett and I spent some time trying to improve the wording, with the idea that if Churchill had written it, it would have sounded more human and enthusiastic. We ran into two problems: first, we were not Churchill; second, we came to the reluctant conclusion that one cannot use such words as 'institution,' 'policies,' 'personnel services,' 'out-of-class services,' 'institutional responsibility,' 'faculty,' etc., without ending with a rather academic statement. Even Churchill might be stumped with this one! We therefore ended with a complete approval of the document as it stood." [Laughter]

Other statements:

"This is a good descriptive statement ... but it doesn't thrill me somehow -- it lacks punch." [Laughter]

"I have submitted our Statement of Principles to three deans, two professors of Education, and one psychologist, and all expressed admiration for the statement."

"The statement still to me has a kind of pontifical tone ... it sounds so much in the tradition of 'papa knows best', and just a bit too paternalistic and benevolent. Why do student personnel administrators need to have this kind of statement of principle? I guess fundamentally I question the whole thing."

I think this one has some very real pertinence. It came from Blair Knapp: "I simply can't suggest the necessity for any change in the current statement that you submitted to me for comment. Obviously, any language is subject to the criticism of some who would prefer a different language in certain particulars. There comes a time when you simply have to close the book and say 'This is it.' I think you and your committee have reached that stage. It is a statement which clearly shows the care and thought which have gone into its composition and I think the membership will accept it wholeheartedly."

Whether you adopt this Statement of Principles or not, there are credits which are due to a number of persons who have worked hard, and with sincerity and ability. To members of the Commission: Maurel Hunkins of Ohio University, Melvin Anderson of Hiram, John Stauffer of Wittenberg, Don Gardner of Akron, Bill Guthrie of Ohio State, Don Parks of Toledo, Godolphin of Princeton. To a large number of Ohio Deans who gave their meetings to the Commission and who sponsored the project in the first place.

A very special salute is due to a number of our critics, whose wisdom was generously given to us to use, and if I may, I would like to say that in my opinion the outstanding contribution of any critic was made by an outstanding friend of this organization, whom I am sorry cannot be with us again this year. I mean our good colleague, Frank Brown of the American Council on Education. Credit is due the Executive Committee for its valuable suggestions and encouragement and support, and for the same things to Blair Knapp.

We believe the value of a statement of principles to NASPA -- the values are these:

1. It states for us our definitive basic beliefs, from the student personnel administration point of view, in brief concise form.

2. It states the responsibilities which always go with the job of student personnel administration. Anyone of us can write a job description with this Statement of Principle as the basis, by adding details and by adding the additional duties he has in his institution.

3. It may help us to capture and understand the idea of student personnel administration's combination of responsibilities to student clientele, to personnel staff specialists, and to the institutions in which we work.

4. It helps to tell our colleagues in education what they have a right to expect of us as student personnel administrators.

Commission II recommends that its job is not done, but is rather a continuing one. There are other types of statements which should be formulated; I think we will grow up to an ability to state our "ethics"; this Statement of Principle must come up for revision in the near future.

The Statement of Principles is imperfect at best in its attempt to capture the definitive quality of the Student Personnel Administrator or in its attempt to state the principles by which he works so that everyone may understand them. If you believe, however, that it will be of value to us and that it does no violence to your convictions or to our prestige, you should vote for its adoption.

I move the adoption of the Statement of Principles as submitted by Commission #2.

... Following is the "Statement of Principles":

The position and work of the Student Personnel Administrator is based upon beliefs that education encompasses the student's whole development towards full and balanced maturity, that each student's education is primarily his own responsibility, and that personnel services must function as an integral part of the total college program to further students' progress towards the objectives which the institution holds for them. He plans and works with faculty, staff, and students for recognition of these principles and for the services, programs, and facilities which implement them.

He contributes to students' understanding and acceptance of the standards, requirements and customs of the educational institution. At the same time, he attempts to have changed any policies, practices or situations which interfere with the students' wholesome growth and learning.

He takes an active part in providing competent professional services as they are needed by students in determining their individual goals and in solving the personal problems which are barriers to their educational progress.

Convinced of the need of students for competence and confidence in social relations, he promotes the development of a campus community which provides broad social opportunities for all students. He seeks also to provide opportunity for students to gain experience in democratic living, in self-determination, in cooperative endeavor and in leadership, and from that experience to learn a keen sense of responsibility for themselves and for service to others.

He helps to establish effective communication of student needs, interests and opinions to the faculty and administration, and communication of faculty and administration opinion and policy to students. He encourages personal relationships between students and faculty because he believes the knowledge and understanding gained is vital to the best work of both.

Because the relationship of college students to persons in authority may influence attitudes held through life, he takes active leadership to bring about the discharge of institutional responsibility according to established principles which are clearly stated, and insists upon fairness, honesty and due respect for the dignity and welfare of students.

...
PRESIDENT KNAPP: Thank you, Dean. Do I hear a second?

DEAN REID: I second the motion.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Is there discussion?

DEAN DONALD M. DU SHANE (University of Oregon): Mr. President, I was at first of the opinion that I should move an amendment, but overwhelmed by the Thesaurus, and out of solicitude for the parliamentary niceties that we have had here tonight I decided I should not move an amendment, but still hold it as my duty to the Commission to point out that in order to make this consistent with our new constitution, adopted at St. Louis last year, one of two amendments should be made. Either the word "he" wherever it appears should be replaced by "he or she" [laughter] or by the word "they", with an accompanying change of tense, a change of number in the word administrator to the plural, and the verb to correspond.

DEAN NEWHOUSE: Gentlemen, is it not commonly understood

that "he" the way it is used here refers to persons of both sexes.

... Cries of "Yes" ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: If you wish to introduce an amendment, Don, so we can get a definitive decision on the part of the group, I think it would be most appropriate. Dean wants to know what this group wants to adopt. It is your statement; if you believe it, let's have it.

... The question was called for ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: All those in favor of the adoption of the statement of policy, please indicate by the usual sign. Contrary minded. The statement is adopted.

May we please record to this Commission our appreciation. I happen to know by indirection only, because I did not participate in it, that hours were spent in trying to get something that would represent our convictions in this regard, and I think we owe them a great deal of gratitude. Let's hear it. [Applause] Thank you, Dean.

In light of the fact that we have held over until later a further discussion of the first part of the report of Commission I, I have asked Frank Piskor if he will give us tonight the report on Commission V. I promised the Chairman of Commissions III and IV that they would not be on until morning, and Frank is ready to go, and must get away early to get a plane. So let's get Commission V before us so we will have time to do our job tomorrow.

DEAN FRANK PISKOR (Chairman, Commission V): In view of the concern for assistant administrators and titles in connection with the report of Commission I, Vic, I am reminded of one story which might well be shared in view of the hour, since I cannot repeat the story about the watch that we had last night.

It seems that at Syracuse we received a telegram from down Cornell way to the effect that they were having a big faculty shindig and needed an outstanding speaker. The standards for the speaker were as follows: He must be a man on your campus with status, preferably the president, but nothing less than a Dean, and he must be a wit. This is a faculty group that needs entertaining.

We don't know who sent the telegram back, but it ran something as follows: We have nothing on this campus lower than a Dean, and we have no wits; but if you'd like to have two half-wits, we'll send the chancellor and vice-chancellor. [Laughter]

That wasn't meant for Blair. He's a president.
[Laughter]

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Thank you.

DEAN PISKOR: My Commission is in a real sense an experiment. A number of us in this Association have felt, as social scientists, that the social sciences could contribute in some measure to the thinking of the membership of this Association. A number of us in our own social science work have found our acquaintanceship with the literature, with the thinking of others in the field very useful for our own administrative purposes. I should note that this statement is simply a statement of direction. We were hoping to develop a kind of preliminary report which could then be torn up by representatives (social scientists) made up primarily of members of this Commission.

We will recommend a little later that the Commission be broadened to include more social science representatives from within this Association. One reason that the number of individuals was kept small was that we were not ready -- we did not know in every case what the subject matter interests or backgrounds were of different people in the Association.

THE RELATIONSHIPS OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES TO STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

The assignment of Commission V grew out of the belief that the wealth of materials in the social sciences which now sporadically influences the work of student personnel administrators could be more systematically marshalled for their use. Political scientists, sociologists, economists, and anthropologists who have also happened to be deans of students, or in other personnel positions, by their own testimony have found much in their specific disciplines transferable and useful in their work with students. But to our knowledge, no systematic attempt has ever been made to review developments in the Social Sciences from the point of view of their implications for student personnel administration.

In none of the social sciences -- not even sociology -- has there been any evidence of extensive interest in applying findings to students and the student situation comparable to the interests of the psychologists in the last twenty-five years. Although an educational sociology comparable in depth and breadth to educational psychology appears to be in the making, there are currently no indications that the social sciences will address themselves in a major way to the problems of students and higher education. Those interested in higher education -- and student

personnel administrators in particular -- will have to take the initiative in extracting useful concepts from the social sciences as far as their field of interest is concerned. From one view, the job of this Commission is to help make the influence of social science materials a more continuing one in student personnel work.

The objectives which we shall attempt to achieve may be outlined as follows:

(a) To identify materials in the various areas of the social sciences which appear to be significant for the practitioner in student personnel administration.

(b) To develop some scheme for the evaluation of the materials which will aid in the selection of those most pertinent for the problems of student personnel workers.

The identification of materials and the search for criteria for their evaluation will be difficult and can be endless. All social science observes human behavior and all of it can have significance for personnel work. The determination of relevant areas, immediately useful to the administrator, without the requirements of tedious orientation for social scientists and non-social scientists alike, is a complicated task. It calls for keen appreciation of the needs of action-minded practitioners as well as a wide knowledge of the social science fields.

It seems to us that three distinct possibilities for inquiry can be considered -- the first dealing with concepts, principles and techniques having transferability for student personnel work; the second concerned with the growing literature produced by social scientists utilizing campuses as laboratories or areas for study and applying the categories of their specific disciplines in such studies; and the third concentrating on the location and study of instances on campuses throughout the country where social science findings and social engineering suggestions have been applied to the solution of campus community problems.

The first possibility listed above points up four topics for exploration. They are:

1. The conceptual frameworks, that is to say, the ways of viewing human behavior or the ways of theorizing about it in each social science discipline.

2. The principles or confirmed hypotheses in each field.

3. The research techniques of particular applicability to personnel work, such as the interview and the sociogram.

4. The manipulative techniques developed by social scientists to communicate and engineer their findings, such as the conference and the sociodrama.

As previously noted all four topics are assumed to have transfer value for student personnel administration, although the original formulations were in no way related to our field of interest. To illustrate, the anthropologist's notion of culture, the sociologist's working concept of the human group, the social psychologist's definition of institutional attitudes, the political scientist's conceptualization of power, authority, and delegation can all be systematically utilized by student personnel workers to clarify their daily administrative problems and to develop new approaches for their solution. At least, that is the view this Commission would like to explore.

In a recent compendium on Human Relations and Administration Dr. Robert Dubin of the University of Illinois includes readings on such matters as "Functions of Status Systems in Formal Organizations," "The Reign of Rules," "Informal Organizations and the 'Grapevine'," "Status and Informal Relations" and "Organization Fictions." Dubin even includes an essay which most of us could study with profit entitled "Executives' Job Fatigue"! We have heard practical day-to-day deans' problems discussed by members of this Association reflecting interest in every one of the topics mentioned. Although most of the concepts utilized in these essays are oriented and developed in the industrial setting, all of them have implications for our work and our field.

In similar vein, Fritz Roethlisberger's ideas on the non-logical behavior and the sentiments of people in organization set forth so directly and simply in his "Management and Morale" provide fresh insight into fraternity and all sorts of group problems. Paul Appleby in a recent political science contribution entitled "Policy and Administration" defines administration as the eighth political process, stressing in a stimulating way the kinds of administrative compromise and adjustment found in the executive branch of our government. All of you would find his analysis highly reminiscent of campus compromise and adjustment, and the principles he points up useful in enlarging your understanding of your job.

At this point in our deliberations there is no need to develop in detail the ways in which a study of social science principles and techniques could function to increase our insights

into our work. The observations made above regarding conceptual frameworks apply equally to the areas concerned with principles and techniques. It might be noted in passing that the interview has been improved as a basic personnel tool through its use as a social science research technique. Similarly current experimentation among social scientists with sociometric devices holds much promise for improving our work with groups. Among manipulative techniques role playing appears to have real promise in helping us resolve problems of student participation.

Although a comprehensive investigation was not possible, the Commission has been impressed with the growth of literature in which social scientists have used the campus as the area for study and experimentation. The research monograph of Allport, Gillespie and Young on "The Religion of the Post-War College Student," Robert Redfield's study of "Race and Religion in Selective Admission," Seymour Harris' studies in the economics of education, particularly "Market for College Graduates" illustrate this development. It appears to be of sufficient significance to be worthy of an intensive survey.

Our third category might be labelled as Campus Administrative Engineering with institutional devices and techniques suggested by social scientists. Antioch College, for example, uses many of the ideas developed by political scientists for city manager governments in its own unique campus community government organization. The social scientists and the administrative deans work closely and usually jointly on the problems of campus government. Our own Dean Fred Weaver was recently instrumental in the distribution of "Out of a Classroom in Chapel Hill," a description of a campus government experiment directly influenced by social scientists. Our Commission feels that it would be most worthwhile to identify and to study such campus situations where social scientists and administrators have joined to work mutually on campus community problems involving all facets of student life, bringing to their study the concern of adults without giving it the label "child's play."

Harold D. Lasswell, the eminent political scientist, once observed that it was the function of social science to "complicate" the problems of decision making. By "complicate" Lasswell meant to call attention dramatically to his view of the social scientist's function, namely, bringing to the administrator the possible alternatives in any given situation and the probable consequences. If his view is accepted, the function of social science in student personnel work is to "complicate" the decision-making of student personnel administrators. The job of our Commission can be formulated as an attempt to determine the most desirable ways in which the social sciences can "complicate" our administrative lives.

If we are successful, this effort should accomplish, among other things, the following:

1. It should help develop a more balanced theory of student personnel administration. We have practitioners in this Association with the requisite background and skill who should be encouraged to formulate their experience into usable theory. The Commission feels that out of studies in the three categories it has identified, stimulation might be provided in the form of readings and cases for student personnel workers which would cut across all the social science fields. We are not proposing anything new. This kind of mutual stimulation goes on all the time in the meetings of this Association. We are simply suggesting another vehicle to accomplish more inter-play of ideas. Eventually this sort of effort has obvious implications for training in student personnel work.

2. It should enrich the psychological findings we already use by widening their usefulness and application in the institutional situation. That is to say, our applied principles will be even more beneficial, used against the broad framework of social science thinking. Eventually, the groundwork might be developed for a new integration of psychology and the social sciences.

Any college administrator deals with what Fritz Roethlisberger of Harvard long ago called "cooperative phenomena." No decision is made apart from the reactions and relationships of the people affected by it. Family pressures, other administrative views, traditions, public relations, all help to make up the atmosphere in which facts must be viewed in the process of decision-making in education. The influences of the various social sciences on this process can increase its meaningfulness.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of this report.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: I think that is a most thought-provoking report, and perhaps a pioneering one. A motion has been made and seconded that the report be received. Is there discussion of the report?

... The question was called for ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: All those in favor signify by the usual sign. Opposed. The motion is carried.

... Announcements ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: In the interest of democratic procedure -- and of course you understand what that is. At a recent town meeting the chairman was very much interested in the adoption of a motion before his meeting. He entertained discussion about as long as he could stand it, and then he said, "All those in favor say aye." About six out of 100 said "aye." He said, "The motion is adopted." Somebody rose up in the back of the room and said, "Mr. Chairman, you didn't ask for the 'no's,'" He said, "I know I didn't. I've seen too many good resolutions lost that way." [Laughter]

We are not going to operate on that principle. If in your thoughtfulness about Statement I, either in its summary or in its total form, you have suggestions, specifically, as to ways in which you would like it amended, may I recommend that you come prepared with those written out so that they can be presented in an orderly fashion, after we have received the reports of Commissions III and IV tomorrow morning.

Fred, are there announcements?

SECRETARY TURNER: No announcements.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: If not, the chair has heard a motion, seconded and all the "ayes" necessary to adjourn.

... The Conference recessed at ten o'clock ...

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

April 4, 1952

The Conference reconvened at nine-fifteen o'clock, President Knapp presiding.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: May we please be in order.

I am sorry to report that Les Rollins is ill this morning and unable to present the report for Commission III, but Vernon Alden, who is Director of Student Aid at Harvard School of Business, had planned to make the main body of the report in any event, so I asked him if he would be good enough to make a few introductory remarks that Dean Rollins was going to make.

DEAN VERNON R. ALDEN (Director of Student Financial Aid, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration; Commission III): We are keenly disappointed that Les cannot be with us this morning. About one o'clock last night he became quite ill. He finally awakened the rest of the fellows who suggested he go to the hospital. There seems to be some congestion in his chest, or a virus of some sort. Tom Graves, who is also with us, is now checking with the hospital in Colorado Springs, and we hope to have some word on him before the meeting is over this morning. I know that Les will be keenly disappointed that he cannot be here this morning to take part in the presentation, because he has been very conscientious about preparing for this presentation.

Although our Commission was clearly understood to be a temporary Commission, one that would pass on its research and findings to a permanent Commission (which we hope will be established this next year) Les took quite a bit of responsibility on trying to prepare as complete and helpful a report as possible. During the year he held meetings throughout the country, with Deans and other people who are interested in this subject. He has been on the telephone the last month talking with a great many foundations, hoping that financial backing might be obtained if the permanent Commission wishes to undertake some sort of a formal program. At the same time he has been talking with Dr. Adams of the American Council of Education. Apparently his organization is interested in making some sort of a permanent study of this problem and are looking to this organization for some sort of leadership or inspiration, or at least some contribution to the program which we want to set up.

I would much prefer to make my talk this morning an

informal and extemporaneous one, but having listened to Dean Newhouse last night, I understand that the words and the way you put them together are pretty important in a report such as this. [Laughter] So I hope you will forgive me for having to rely on the written report which we prepared before this meeting. So we will proceed with the report on which we worked together for presentation this morning.

At last year's meeting of the Association the Executive Committee recommended that a commission be established to study the problem of "Developing and Training Student Personnel Administrators." The Commission's purpose was described as follows:

"This Commission shall be specifically charged with the planning and recommendations of the manner in which this Association may most effectively orient and assist those of our members newly inducted into this area of work, or given new and/or additional responsibilities in the area. This Commission will merely formalize that which has been an age-old concern of this Association."

Shortly after establishing the Commission, President Blair Knapp appointed as Chairman Dean J. Leslie Rollins of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration. Two of Dean Rollins' associates at the School -- Tom Graves and Vern Alden--expressed an interest in the Commission and helped to prepare this preliminary report. I would like to mention the names of the people who were helpful to us at those meetings: Dean Brett of Texas, Dean Mallett of Purdue, Dean MacMinn of Oklahoma, Dean Nowotny of Texas, Dean Nygreen of Washington, Dean Penberthy of Texas A. & M., Dean Tate of Georgia, Dean Weaver of North Carolina, Dr. Williams of Boston University, Dean Williamson of Minnesota, and Dean Wunderlich of Montana. We appreciate the help which you gentlemen gave us in going over this report and suggesting helpful corrections.

In our early discussions we on the present temporary Commission quickly came to the conclusion that this was a tremendously complex study -- one that we could approach from many different sides. To start, we decided to survey the opinions of other student personnel administrators. On visits to colleges in all areas of the country in behalf of our Financial Aid Program at Harvard Business School, we arranged to have both informal conversations and formal meetings with deans and other college administrators to consider the problem of training student personnel administrators. We talked also with college administrators whose interests were of a more academic nature to get as broad a sample of opinion as possible.

Realizing that the members of this Association -- both past and present -- have done much thinking and some writing about this subject, we also made a general review of the literature in this field. We found the minutes of past annual meetings of the Association especially helpful. Not only have there been many informal discussions about the training of personnel administrators, but there have been at least three fairly complete and intensive surveys made in this area. Obviously it is impossible to give credit in this report to the many individuals and committee members who have made contributions in the past. We should like to review, however, a few of the statements and the studies at previous Association meetings.

SUMMARY OF PAST NASPA DISCUSSIONS

At the meeting in 1930, Dean Armstrong of Northwestern University described a dean of men as follows: "(1) He is an executive. He is not only expected to talk about things, he is expected to do something about them or see that something is done. (2) He is an educator. He is concerned with the aims and effectiveness of the educational procedure. (3) He is a counsellor. (4) He is a specialist on the problems of youth and on the complexities of life at that age. In summary, the dean is an integrating and coordinating agent operating in the interest of the university as a whole and the entirety of educational values."

In 1931, a series of speeches were made at the conference entitled, "Preparation for the Work of Dean of Men." Dean Thomas A. Clark of the University of Illinois said, "I think personal knowledge of human nature and belief in it...is the main thing. I don't know whether you can learn that or not... Natural ability is the main thing; and after that the broadest general training which we can get is helpful... I think it is pretty largely a matter of intelligence, and not training."

Dean Joseph A. Bursley of the University of Michigan said in talking about the same subject, "I am afraid that I am not in sympathy with the idea of any fixed course of training for the position of dean of men. I do not believe that it is possible to prepare one's self for this work by taking certain pre-arranged courses of study. The best and most successful deans of men are born and not made... If he hasn't the right qualifications, no amount of theoretical training in courses reputed to prepare one for the work of a dean of men will do him any good in my opinion. He is either cut out for the job or he isn't and that is all there is to it."

At the 1932 meeting, Dean Donfred Gardner of the University of Akron reported on a survey of functions performed by

deans of men and courses of study which they felt had specifically prepared them for handling these functions.

The minutes of all the early meetings of the Association were highlighted by the speeches and extemporaneous comments of the late Dean Coulter of Purdue. Many of his ideas are as refreshing today as they were 25 years ago. We younger men in the group found much inspiration in his comments about preparation for the work of a dean of men. At the meeting in 1933 he said, "I sometimes feel that about the best book of guidance the deans ever had, the thing they ought to have in their minds more than any other book, is the Bible."

At the same meeting Dean Rivenburg of Bucknell suggested that summer pilgrimages be arranged for young men beginning as deans of men. "I would be delighted personally," he said, "to spend four weeks in the summer time, a week at each of four universities, getting pointers that I know would be of very great value to me and my institution."

By far the most complete study on preparation for the work of a dean was presented in 1936 by a committee headed by Dean Turner of Illinois. The committee's report included a resume of statements made by Association members at previous annual meetings, an evaluation of the 1932 survey, and a study of the responses to a questionnaire sent to 174 deans throughout the United States. This questionnaire uncovered many interesting facts concerning a dean's preparation for his job -- college degrees held, undergraduate institutions he attended, the work experience he has had, and college subjects he has studied and has found useful. Deans polled in the survey were also asked to suggest inherent qualities which qualified an individual for the work of dean of men -- social traits, temperamental traits, mental traits, character traits, physical traits, etc. The survey concluded with eight primary conclusions based upon the questionnaire study.

These eight conclusions were: "(1) A Baccalaureat degree plus a Master's degree and if possible the Doctor's degree is desirable. (2) Teaching experience and educational administrative work are desirable. (3) Courses taken by Deans of Men which have aided them most in their work are psychology, education, general liberal arts courses and sociology. (4) Experiences which have proved most valuable to deans have been teaching in educational administration, work with young people by participating in activities, business experiences, and religious work. (5) The majority of deans feel that most deans are successful because they are born with inherent qualities which aid them or are essential, but their effectiveness can be increased by further

training. (6) The most important inherent qualities in a dean of men are social and temperamental traits, and these inherent qualities are equally essential, if not more so, than specific training. (7) If deans were outlining suggested courses for prospective deans of men, they would include particularly education, psychology, general liberal arts courses, sociology, philosophy, English, business and hygiene. (8) In order to secure practical experience other than academic, the Deans of Men suggested particularly: apprenticeship to a Dean of Men, work with activities, educational administrative duties, and counselling and interviewing." Dean Turner's Committee followed up this study with a second survey which was presented at the annual meeting in 1939.

In 1940, Dean McCreery of Washington State College presented a paper entitled, "The Dean's Day or Why in Hell Didn't I Go Into Life Insurance?" Incidentally, Dean McCreery is, as most of you know, now a successful business executive. Eighteen deans had agreed to keep diaries and send him reports on their typical day's activities. We were impressed to find that almost all of the 80 different activities reported might be called administrative problems rather than academic ones. In each, they had to work through people in their offices or student body. In range they extended to all corners of the academic world.

THE PRESENT COMMISSION'S APPROACH

Although our subject -- the Development and Training of Student Personnel Administrators -- has been discussed both formally and informally by the Association for over 25 years, seemingly no formal action has ever been taken to help young men become adequately trained and developed to carry on this important work. It is significant that the Executive Committee which recommended the establishment of this Commission has charged it with the responsibility of formalizing such a program.

The Commission clearly recognized that there are at least two stages in the training of Student Personnel Administrators. The first is the formal educational experience, both undergraduate and graduate. The second involves all experiences other than formal education. You will recall that the Commission's assignment was to "assist those...newly inducted into this work or given new and/or additional responsibilities." The Commission interpreted this assignment as one dealing with the second stage--those experiences beyond formal education.

We also recognized the importance of the personal traits or characteristics essential to those working in Student Personnel Administration -- such qualities as integrity, human understanding, honesty, patience, and faith. The surveys and discussions of the Association through the years have provided much useful

background material in this area. The Commission assumed that the man with whom it would be concerned already has these characteristics. In other words, he already has the "raw material" and has been "pledged" into the Student Personnel Administrator's profession. Now we are concerned with his "in-service" training.

As we have talked with student personnel administrators, deans, college presidents, and others in preparing this report, we have searched for other characteristics or skills which they should bring to their jobs. We have asked ourselves and others: In all of the myriad backgrounds, personality traits, goals, and functions of people now on these jobs, is there any characteristic or skill common to recognized leaders in the field? Is there any central "core of ability" possessed by the successful administrator at the lower level and the person at the top as well? If there is such a common skill, can it be isolated and successfully communicated to others?

From our reading and our discussions we have concluded, at least tentatively, that the man we are trying to examine more closely must have two basic and broad characteristics: He must be an administrator, and he must be an educator. His job as a student personnel administrator, and the higher position in educational administration for which he may be preparing, both require administrative and educational skill and ability.

Most of the past discussions and reports of this Association have been concerned primarily with this man as an Educator. We have some ideas on how to train and develop a man to be an Educator, but that is outside the scope of this preliminary report. Instead we on the Commission, at the suggestion of many college administrative friends, have agreed to focus our attention on the other concern of the Educational Administrator, the problem of finding out if there is such a thing as Administrative skill which can be acquired and which can be communicated.

It should be clearly understood that this emphasis on administration in this report is in no way meant to exaggerate the importance of administrative skills or minimize other skills. "Administration is inherently a personal function or a group of personal functions." It consists largely of making day-to-day decisions -- decisions involving other people. "Since Administration is so largely a human function and since it involves so many decisions projecting into the future, it is a particularly difficult subject for scientific analysis," according to Dr. Melvin Copeland at Harvard. If there were simple formulas for describing a competent administrator, someone in this Association would have presented them long ago.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF HARVARD GRADUATE
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

We Commission members who wrote the first draft of this report are on the faculty of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration. As most of you know, the aim of this School is to provide the opportunity for men to develop themselves for responsible administrative positions. For over forty years its faculty members have been studying administration, trying to define the skills and characteristics of a good administrator, and experimenting with methods for teaching administration. We are quick to admit that we do not have the answers; there is much yet to be learned about administration. The forces with which we deal are complex and we have discovered from our own experience that they resist simplification. Nevertheless, we on the Commission are reluctant to begin a study of the educational administrator without availing ourselves of the thinking of faculty members of the School.

Although there is no simple formula to describe the competent administrator, we believe that certain skills and characteristics are essential: "(1) the ability to work effectively with people, (2) the ability to make sound decisions in the light of available facts and under pressures of time, (3) the ability to draw upon a fund of substantive knowledge and upon the capacities of others who possess specialized skills and knowledge, and (4) the capacity to draw these abilities together and use them as an integrated whole."

In attempting to describe what we mean by administration, we have found the following definition useful:

"Administration is the determination and execution of policies involving action. Such policies must be conceived by men, and such action must be effected by human organizations. Whether he is the factory foreman, the assistant chief of a government bureau, or the company president (and we might add, the college dean, the student personnel administrator or the college president), the successful administrator understands human nature and knows as individuals those whom he leads. Accorded authority not only by those above him but also by those below him, he nevertheless does his work without showing his authority. Knowing that change is rapid and sometimes sweeping, the competent administrator is flexible in his thinking and accepts change as a challenge. He stands ready to act, often on incomplete data. He errs less often than he succeeds; he learns from his mistakes and does not repeat them. In carrying out his decisions, he realizes that the best conceived plans may fail through poor timing, inappropriate assignments, or inadequate means of testing results. No doubt some men have a greater

aptitude for administrative work than others, but it is safe to say that for the most part administrators are not born; they are made. And they are made by an arduous educational process."

CONCLUSIONS

Those of us who prepared this preliminary report feel that there is such a thing as "administrative skill" commonly possessed by the successful administrator at all levels of college administrative work. We believe that these abilities can be acquired and can be communicated. We feel that a formal Commission should be established to continue the study of this problem. Should the Association agree to establish a permanent Commission, perhaps one or more of the following plans of action will be a useful means of beginning a formal study,

1. With funds which have been promised to us already, the Commission could secure the services of a full-time researcher. This person should be a skilled observer. One of his functions would be to collect cases covering specific, day-to-day administrative problems of student personnel administrators. He would describe some of the "typical" problems in short, written reports, which would be discussed and analyzed at meetings of the Commission during the coming year. From these experimental discussions, we might find that group problem analysis will be helpful in training and developing younger Association members for greater administrative responsibilities. Perhaps, too, we might discover that such studies will be stimulating to the older, more experienced deans. Lively discussions of current college administrative problems, with younger and older members of the Association participating, could broaden the administrative capacities of both groups.

2. As a second alternative means of beginning our formal study, we suggest that a member of the Association take a leave of absence of six months or a year to study all aspects of administration within a selected university. Financed by funds to be raised by the Commission, he will be given free access to the resources of that university. He will be at liberty to attend all administrative meetings or investigate any or all decisions affecting student life. Any lectures or classes attended would serve what is essentially a process of self-education for its own sake without reference to the winning of formal credits. Such a program, if as successful as the small, experimental Carnegie Corporation program for college administrative officers, might become a regular pattern for training promising men in the Association.

(And we add that the formal Commission, when and if it

is established should interview the twenty-five college administrators who have held Carnegie grants for suggestions on how that operates.)

3. A third alternative is to approach one of the foundations for a substantial grant to undertake a five-year study of administration within selected universities, with all departments of those universities working cooperatively. Responsibility for collecting information and preparing a report would be placed in the hands of committees representing the Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Education, and other departments in the universities. The committees would function under the guidance and counsel of the Association and would publish their findings as a project of the Association.

4. As a final possibility we suggest an investigation of the "Advanced Management" type of program which is burgeoning all over the country (at Columbia, Harvard, Northwestern, Stanford, Washington, Western Ontario, and other universities). These five to thirteen week training programs for seasoned business executives might be adapted for experienced college administrators.

We know that many of you are keenly aware of the need for a program for training and developing Student Personnel Administrators. Even outside of this Association there are many who are pointing out the need for trained administrative talent for leadership in the colleges. We feel that it is appropriate to close this part of our presentation with a quotation from President Charles Dollard's Annual Report (1951) of the Carnegie Corporation of New York:

"When a good man is persuaded to forsake teaching and research for administrative work, he is all too apt to discover that henceforth his personal development is a matter of concern only to himself. Sabbatical leaves, fellowships, opportunities for leisurely travel and study -- all the rewards and safety valves which help to keep the teacher and scholar fresh and vigorous -- are almost completely denied to his administrative colleagues. The result is that the very men who should be the most imaginative and enterprising in the institution are often the most stale and inert; and that the reservoir of trained administrative talent which is needed to supply new leadership is a discouragingly small one."

Thanks very much. [Applause]

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Thank you, Vernon. At the request of the Commission, discussion of this report will be deferred until

we hear from President Paul Pitman, formerly a dean of men on the coast, who was invited by Les Rollins to address himself to this same problem, and his remarks will constitute a part of the report of this Commission. Then we will discuss both, following President Pitman's presentation. [Applause]

PRESIDENT PAUL M. PITMAN (College of Idaho): President Knapp, Fellow Administrators: I must frankly confess that I am puzzled as to why I should have been chosen to supplement the report you have just heard. Perhaps it was thought that a man who has been kicked upstairs might encourage some of you younger men who hope for promotion; but take it from me, the college presidency is no promotion. [Laughter]

If you don't want to be misunderstood, if you don't want to be lonely, if you don't want to be worried about enrollment and money and the vagaries of a Board of Trustees and the obstinacy of a faculty, don't ever let yourself be tagged for what Carlson calls "the roughest profession in the world." But me, I love it. I exalt in the challenge of it; the struggle exhilarates me. I enjoy fighting for my ideals. I rejoice in the opportunity to infuse an entire institution with the personnel point of view, and I covet the opportunity for creativity.

For eleven years I was a Dean of Men, yet I was never able to attend this Conference because I was unable so to persuade my president. [Laughter] Now that I have become a college president I find myself completely at home as I pay my first visit, for I agree wholeheartedly with David's belief that there are certain fundamental skills which are common to competent administration at every level. It is true that the substantive knowledge on which the college president draws is somewhat different from that which forms the work of the Dean of Men, but the basic skills through which this knowledge is applied are essentially the same for all executives who work with persons.

Like many of you, I became a Dean of Men by accident. By accident also I came to the presidency. In both jobs I have had to learn the hard way. It might be natural therefore for me to disparage professional training and to exalt those basic qualities of head and heart which are required of any man who wishes to succeed as an administrator at any level.

Rabbi Louis Newman once spoke for me on the ABC's of success: Ambition, brains, character. It was a good speech, effectively delivered. Most of you would have applauded it. I too am a preacher, although I have never served a parish church, and I could give the virtues which religion teaches and most of you practice, but I say to you in all frankness that

virtue is not enough. I know from costly personal experience that true success is not so simple.

Last October at our 60th Anniversary Henry R. Luce put this matter very bluntly. Instead of saying "Hell is paved with good intentions" he asked a penetrating question, "What has done the most damage in the world, bad hearts or bad heads?"

No, your Commission is dead right when it insists that successful administration is more than a matter of simple virtue, more even than substantive knowledge, that it is a matter of skill, of skills which can be learned, of skills which must be learned. And I trust that you will follow the Commission's recommendation that you will create a permanent, or semi-permanent, Commission and that you will charge that Commission with the responsibility of still further identifying these skills and of seeking to discover how they may be acquired or communicated.

Having emphasized my conviction that successful administration is not a question of either/or, but of both/and, that the truly successful administrator is one who weds knowledge to purpose, skill to heart, and training to character, I should like to leave the further consideration of administrative skills to your Commission. I shall leave with them also the problem of discovering ways in which these skills may best be developed or communicated.

What I really want to do today is to address myself to the most basic of the three requirements for successful administration, of which the first is substantive knowledge. Knowledge is valuable for it is the worker's tools, and without tools one can build very little.

The second is skill. A personnel administrator with broad knowledge and no administrative skill is like the man who buys a beautiful set of power tools but who does not know how to operate them. He may arouse the envy of his friends, but he doesn't fool his wife. [Laughter]

The third, the most difficult and the most precious of all these requirements, is the administrator himself. What manner of man must he be?

A year ago January I attended the meeting of the Association of American Colleges in Atlantic City. It was the Presidential year of Dan Marsh who was just completing 25 years, a quarter of a century, as the President of Boston University. He made an address which some of you may have heard, more of you

may have read, in which he attempted to put his finger on some of the most basic requirements for a first-rate college president -- and as I have already indicated, I regard the same qualities as being common to all personnel administrators -- and among the eleven or twelve essentials which he listed at the head of the list he put patience.

As a man who is now nearing the end of his second year in the presidency, I can confess that I am coming to have an ever higher regard for patience. [Laughter] Some of the most difficult times I have had, and some of the greatest unsolved problems that will face me upon my return to my own campus, are problems which have been created or at least aggravated by my impatience, for my impatience has led to misunderstanding, and where there is misunderstanding and lack of communication you can't do a damn thing. [Laughter]

As I rode home on the train from the east coast, I thought to myself, "Patience, yes, that is fine. That is important, but I know one that is more fundamental even than patience." When I returned home I told my wife about the convention and of the address, and I said, "I have one that is more important than Dan Marsh's patience and that is imagination, for without imagination there is no vision. Without imagination there cannot even be sympathy, and without sympathy how can one pull his people together into a team, because he cannot see into the minds and the hearts of his co-workers. He cannot feel with them; he cannot communicate with them; and so he cannot work effectively with them." She nodded her head and said, "I think you are right. I think that is more important than patience." Then three or four minutes later she said, "But I know one that is more important than either patience or imagination, and that is honesty, just plain, simple honesty." And she was not talking about keeping my hand out of the till, she was talking about that honesty as is between man and man, the sort of thing you were talking about yesterday as I sat next to you at lunch. The more I think about it, the more convinced I am that she is right.

Then just a few weeks ago I read this article by President Carlson of Vermont, in the winter issue of the American Scholar, and he lists still another virtue as being the supreme quality needed in the college president, in the personnel administrator: courage. And I am inclined to revise my own order, and to put courage above even honesty, because it seems to me that that is the soil out of which honesty springs. The reason why we are tempted not to be honest is a lack of courage.

In the Commission's report there is an implied emphasis -- in fact it is stated in that common corps of abilities to

which Dean Davis refers -- this ability to pull everything together into one integrated whole. It is the objective of each of us in personnel work. It is the objective of liberal education. And I should like to suggest to you that perhaps we should pay a little more attention to integrity in the administrator, and I am not now talking about integrity in the common sense of honesty. I am talking about it in its fundamental sense, the administrator who is an integer, a whole number, not a collection of fractions.

In order that I may avoid the danger of preachment, I should like to illumine what is in my mind by the telling of a story, a very dramatic story about a man who achieved a higher degree of integrity, of wholeness, than any person of whom I have ever heard -- Simon L'Ouvrier.

... At this point in his address President Pitman gave a dramatic and stimulating descriptive and narrative statement of the life of the great French actor Simon L'Ouvrier. From the situations in the life of the man, President Pitman drew the following conclusions which applied to his final points ...

PRESIDENT PITMAN: I have spoken of patience, of imagination, of honesty, of courage and of integrity, but even integrity, I say to you men, is not enough. There must to this list be added "faith."

These are hard days in which we live, days which test the fiber of everyone of us, and it is my conviction that no man can be a truly successful administrator at any level whose life is not rooted and grounded in something which is larger than himself. I am not speaking of structural ecclesiastical religion; I am speaking of that which is more important: Functional religion which cuts way down beneath all the sects and creeds which divide us. Have I omitted humility? No. Humility is born of faith. Only the faithless man is egotistical, beats his breast, claims credit which belongs to others. But the man who has real faith, who believes implicitly in life (the richness, the strength, the power, the beauty and the glory of life), who feels himself a part of an infinite universe, who sees his students, his fellow teachers, his fellow administrators also as living parts of that same living universe, such a man rises beyond egotism. He recognizes that that which he is, and that which he is able to accomplish comes from outside himself, flows through him and through his fellow workers.

I wish the new Commission good hunting as it seeks to help us to understand more clearly what are those creative skills by which we may better do our job. But they cannot do for you or for me that which we must do for ourselves: Grow into the

kind of men to whom these skills may safely be entrusted.

... Prolonged applause ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Thank you, President Pitman.

The report of Commission III is before you. Is there discussion on the report?

DEAN DONALD MALLET (Purdue University): I move the adoption of the report.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Is there discussion of the motion?

... The question was called for ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: All those in favor of the motion signify by the usual sign. Opposed. The motion is adopted.

It is now my pleasure to present Dean Ed. Williamson, who will present the report of Commission IV, "Program and Practices Evaluation."

DEAN McBRIDE: May I move our thanks and appreciation to the members of Commission III and President Pitman for his address?

PRESIDENT KNAPP: You certainly may.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: All those in favor signify by the usual sign. Opposed. The motion is adopted. Ed, go ahead; it is yours.

DEAN E. G. WILLIAMSON (University of Minnesota; Commission IV): Mr. President and Gentlemen: The task assigned to this Commission was described as follows in the minutes of the 1951 meeting in St. Louis:

"This commission shall assist the members of our Association in formulating the criteria and techniques by which they may most effectively appraise their own programs and work. The commission should further have a responsibility for encouraging and facilitating the exchange of ideas on program and practices among member institutions."

Your Commission accepted the indicated responsibilities with the understanding that its efforts during its first year would be the first step in a series of studies and program developments. That is, the Commission felt, and wishes to recommend, that the problem of evaluation be dealt with in a formal manner in each annual meeting. In our judgment, this problem is so complex and so important that its study should be a continuing responsibility of the Association.

Our present report, therefore, should be considered as the preliminary step in a long series of investigations and discussions on this topic. In this first report we shall do little more than outline and point out some of the many complexities and some of the possible approaches to the needed comprehensive study of this most important problem.

Your Commission recognizes that there are a number of different ways of evaluating student personnel services and more specifically the effectiveness of a Dean of Students. We shall discuss briefly some of these points of view and methods. But first, let us point out that the collection of data on which to base evaluative judgments about personnel practices in institutions may take two forms. First, it is relatively easy to collect data statistical in nature with regard to the extent of the services. That is, it is relatively easy to count the number of students given jobs, scholarships, and financial grants, the number of students treated at the health service, and the number given academic counsel. But the collection of sound data on which to base judgments of the quality and effectiveness of these services is another matter and one for which we may not at the present time have adequate answers. This is not to say that the mere quantity reports of services have no importance. All those who must deal with the complex administrative task of formulating a budget request know full well that all such requests must be buttressed by quantity indices of program needs. Indeed, it is a long established practice in administrative circles to state program needs in terms of quantity or volume of services offered and needed, as well as the number of students given such services. Nevertheless, the quantity index does not indicate the effectiveness of the service, except in a very rough, general way. That is, if the students receiving the service felt that it was not effective, then their requests and demands for service would undoubtedly decrease, thereby affecting the quantity index. But in general, the quantity index is only a rough indication of the quality and effectiveness of the service provided for students.

With regard to methods of arriving at evaluative judgments of effectiveness of programs, your committee wishes to suggest for consideration four general methods.

Let me preface my remarks by saying that of course there is a very simple way of dealing with this complex problem, much simpler than the one I am going to outline, and I suppose I ought to hold it out as perhaps an enticing alternative to what I am going to say.

There are roughly, in the day-to-day tumble of administrative practices three indices of effectiveness. I can illustrate the first one by saying that my own president, who is a very, very firm and informed believer and backer of our program, quite frequently -- facetiously but still earnestly -- says, "If I don't hear anything from the Office of the Dean of Students, that is fine with me. I assume that you are protecting me from an explosion among students." That is an index of effectiveness; a very simple one. Would that we could always use it to our credit.

Then there is a second index of effectiveness which members of my staff (and no doubt your staff) use, "Did you get a salary increase this year?"

Then of course there is always the third index of effectiveness that the students use to evaluate student personnel advisers, and especially Deans of Students, "Are you going to leave us alone this year?"

But to be a little more formal now in considering this complex problem of effectiveness, let me outline very briefly four methods which are currently in use in different institutions.

The first method is widely used and is quite informal and sometimes casual in its application. We refer to the casual day-to-day impression each member of the staff experiences by listening to his faculty colleagues as they make evaluative comments and also as reports and comments are published in the student committees and groups. These bits of evidence are constantly available, but they must be carefully evaluated in the context of the total program of the institution. That is, stray and occasional remarks, both derogatory and commendatory, should not be over-interpreted as being necessarily representative of the reactions of the entire student body. On the other hand, we believe firmly that occasionally even a solitary and isolated remark can set the alert administrator on the trail in search of evaluative judgments which are substantial and dependable. It may not be necessary to have a scientifically representative sampling of the entire student body in order to judge whether a service is good or bad. But one must be careful in making judgments that do not represent a cross-section of opinion among students. It would be better if such occasional and often atypical remarks were accepted as tentative indications of effectiveness, or ineffectiveness,

to be used as a starting point for more systematic and rigorous evaluation through the collection of additional evidence bearing on the service in question. That is, an occasional remark about a service may lead to a more systematic collection of representative judgment from many independent sources.

A second important way of evaluating the effectiveness of a service involves the use of a systematic check list or score card in which the critical points in question serve to make the evaluation both comprehensive and balanced. The check list may be used by members of the staff performing the service, but usually better results will be obtained by getting judgments from those whose responsibilities do not include the management of the service itself, to get an outsider's point of view, as it were. Members of other departments within an institution and qualified consultants from other institutions may be called upon to make these comprehensive surveys.

Wrenn and Kamm have also described a score card type of evaluation survey in which arbitrary numerical weights are assigned to the evaluative description of specific services provided in the comprehensive student institutional personnel program. We wish to quote from the description of this survey of the score card method in order to illustrate this important method of evaluation.

STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICE IV (WEIGHT=3)

Providing counseling services which, with the aid of diagnostic facilities and other referral agencies, assist the students in adjusting to and planning for his educational, vocational, emotional, social, and religious growth.

A. Philosophy of the institution studied, with regard to the above service:

1. The administration does not consider the services as essential for student adjustment and development. ()
2. The administration is seemingly undecided as to the merits of the service. ()
3. The administration believes in the service wholeheartedly. ()

Remarks:

B. Provisions for the above service:

1. There is a clinical counselor (or counselors) serving in an all-campus capacity. These are prepared to do general counseling at a clinical level, including the analysis of occupational or educational objectives or the analysis and treatment of emotional factors involved in social, educational, religious, financial, and vocational adjustment. ()
2. In addition to No. 1, there are resource people available for specialized information and therapy in the following

areas:

- a. Educational ()
- b. Vocational ()
- c. Religious ()
- d. Emotional ()
- e. Social ()

3. Some faculty members (not necessarily trained in counseling) spend part of their time offering personalized services such as registration and curriculum advising, or acting as general sponsors for a group of students. ()
4. Some faculty members act more fully as counselors and are given some release from teaching load, or given extra compensation for this service. ()
5. An in-service training program is carried on for faculty sponsors and/or faculty-counselors. ()
6. Interpretation of test results is available to faculty members. ()
7. Diagnosis and remedial attention in the areas of study skills and speech are available to students. ()
8. Active use is made of occupational information available at a central agency. ()
9. Group testing programs are utilized for counseling purposes. ()
10. A system of articulation exists between campus personnel services and faculty counselors. ()
11. A systematic effort is made to inform students and faculty of counseling services. ()
12. Research is carried on to determine the effectiveness of counseling procedures, remedial services, and testing instruments. ()

Remarks: (Indicate here the number of clinically trained counselors who spend one half or more of their time counseling students) ()

C. Information secured from:

1. Members of the personnel staff ()
2. Members of the administrative staff ()
3. Members of the faculty ()
4. Members of the student body ()

D. Degree to which Student Personnel Service IV is carried out in meeting the needs of students:

-1	0	+1	+ 2	+ 3
Need present; no service	Need present; service projected	Need present; some service but inade- quate	Need present; service meets re- quirements	Need present; service goes beyond mini- mum require- ments

E. Weight x numerical rating

*C. Gilbert Wrenn and Robert B. Kamm, "A Procedure for Evaluating a Student-Personnel Program," SCHOOL AND SOCIETY 67: 266-269

In other instances a systematic sample of students enrolled in an institution may be given a questionnaire which contains searching questions asking for evaluative judgments about services. Kamm has described such an evaluative questionnaire to be administered to at least two hundred students of a given university or college population.*

*Robert B. Kamm, "An Inventory of Student Reaction to Student Personnel Services," EDUCATIONAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL MEASUREMENT 10: 539-40. Part 2

Some sample questions are included in Kamm's description of the evaluative questionnaire as follows:

"The twelve services and a sample item for each follows:

Recruitment and Admissions

"Do you feel that, previous to your admission, representatives of this institution adequately explained to you the facilities of this campus?

New Student Orientation

"Do you think that this institution made you as a new student feel a part of it and of its activities?

Counseling Services

"Do you feel that students on this campus who must need counseling are receiving such help?

Health Services

"Are you satisfied that your campus health authorities would handle your case competently, in the event you were injured or became seriously ill?

Housing

"Do you feel that this institution is making sufficient effort to improve student housing facilities?

Food Services

"As a rule, do you feel satisfied with the food served you at the campus cafeteria or dining hall?

Extra-Class Activities

"Do you feel that there are enough student organizations and activities on the campus to meet the different needs of students?

Adjustment of the Institutional
Program to Student Needs

"Do you feel that your total college or university experience is such as to better prepare you for intelligent citizenship?"

Student Financial Aids and Part-Time Employment

"If you were 'financially on the rocks,' would you feel free to go to the campus financial aid service for help and counsel?"

Placement Services

"Is your placement office making sufficient effort to keep you informed of current employment trends and needs?"

Student Personnel Records

"Are you of the belief that you are welcome to discuss with a counselor all matters contained in your student personnel folder?"

Guidance in Student Conduct

"Will a student on this campus get a chance to explain his side of the case if he is 'called up' for discipline?"

Another modification of the evaluative survey was used in the four-year program of expert consultation visits to campuses a program sponsored by the Committee on Student Personnel Work of the American Council on Education and financed by the Hazen Foundation. In this program, institutions requested the American Council to employ an expert from a panel of selected consultants of national standing, who visited the campus for two or more days and made evaluative reports and recommendations. The program features surveyed and evaluated were somewhat more fluid than those included in Wrenn and Kamm's score card, but they were still specific in that leading questions and inquiries were directed beforehand to these consultants by institutional staffs. In general, these consultants were brought in to tell the institution what kind of personnel program they had, in the judgment of the consultant, and what was needed to improve its effectiveness. The following statement quoted from the mimeographed instructions to the consultants will illustrate the methods used:

"Purposes and Procedures: The Advisory Service on Student Personnel Work is designed to bring experienced college personnel officials in an advisory capacity to institutions which want their aid, looking toward the improvement of particular aspects of student personnel services or to the inauguration of such services. The consultants do not undertake to solve a college's problems for it. Their purpose is to make their special knowledge available as a help to the institution in using its resources most effectively in the light of the best current thought and practice, to adapt a 'non-directive' technique to a new era of faculty and administrative counseling." You perhaps understand why I balked

a little bit at that term "non-directive". [Laughter]

"The Advisory Service is organized to assist college officers and faculty with their personnel program, rather than to deal directly with the students. The consultant is free to adopt whatever procedures seem wisest to him and his hosts. He may accept speaking engagements at his discretion, but this is not the primary object of his visit. Definite advance planning by the college as to how the time should be spent, a detailed schedule, description of the college's present personnel organization and services, and such preparatory correspondence as either the college or the consultant care to initiate after the descriptive material has been studied, are recommended as a means of making the project most useful.

"Arrangements: The Advisory Service nominates consultants, subject to the institution's approval. When preliminary arrangements have been made, the completion of details is left to the consultant and the institution. The consultant is expected to spend two full days at the college, not counting travel time, as the institution's guest. Longer visits may be arranged at the college's request.

.....

"Report: Both the institution and the consultant are requested to make informal written reports to the Advisory Service upon completion of the visit, for the evaluation of the work and for the guidance through the Advisory Service of future consultants elsewhere. The reports should describe the work done, mention what procedures of the consultation seemed effective and what did not, show the specific problems revealed and the suggestions made, indicate what follow-up, if any, seems advisable to either part, and include whatever general or particular observations on the situation or the project seem warranted."

A third general method used in evaluating the effectiveness of student personnel services is the experimental research method. For the most part this method of experimentation has been used only in evaluating counseling programs. Little seems to have been done, or at least reported in the literature, concerning experiments in determining the actual outcome of the life of students with respect to other student personnel services. For example, nobody knows, I would suppose, whether systematically and experimentally there is evidence to indicate that morale is heightened because of a loan and scholarship program. We do have little bits of evidence in the form of student reports and case histories, but there is no systematic, experimental evaluation. Moreover, there is little experimental literature concerning the value in human development of dormitory counseling or even of dormitory living itself, although for over 300 years in American

higher education we have operated on the unproved assumption (experimentally unproved), as far as I can read the literature, that the collegiate way of living was somehow or other facilitating to the whole process of human development. Somebody ought to really evaluate that experimentally.

There are many judgments favorable to dormitory living, but there is little experimental evidence, and that little is restricted to the use of scholarship as a criterion. In similar manner, there are many testimonials from alumni and even student leaders with respect to the beneficial effects of participation in the extra-curriculum, but there is little experimental evidence to substantiate and support these testimonials. But there are a number of experiments published that indicate systematic counseling does improve scholarship of students. Experimental literature on evaluation is summarized and classified in Froehlich's monograph.*

*Clifford P. Froehlich, EVALUATING GUIDANCE PROCEDURES: A Review of the Literature, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C., 1949.

Let us turn to a most important aspect of our problem. One of the most perplexing problems in the evaluation is that of finding stable and meaningful criteria against which to check the effectiveness of program. Shall we use students' comments and criticisms? Shall we use criticisms of the faculty? Shall we use the administrator's judgment? Shall we use the personnel worker's evaluative comments? Shall we import experts from other institutions to make judgments? Shall we evaluate effectiveness in terms of improved scholarship or in terms of social adjustment? If the latter criterion is used, then what is the best index of social adjustment? Shall we use changes in the personality test to evaluate counseling and other personnel services? These and many more searching questions could be raised, but one is reminded of the old motto and wise conclusion that any fool can raise more questions than ten wise men can answer.

There have been some searching inquiries concerning relevant and meaningful criteria by which to judge. For example, Rackham makes the following general observation concerning the problem of criteria.

"1. The student personnel services program should be an integral part of the total educational program of the institution which it serves; it should be functionally and vitally related to the other aspects of the over-all institutional program.

"2. A student personnel services program should be

judged as a whole and not simply as the sum of its separate parts; weakness in one part of a program may be more than compensated for by strength in another.

"3. Since change is a universal law, any adequate program will possess a flexibility which permits it to adapt itself to varying problems and objectives.

"4. Personnel programs may differ from each other noticeably. It is no more reasonable to expect a 'standard' university or a 'standard' degree. Nevertheless, our colleges and universities have a common nucleus of identical elements. So do degrees. So then, we should say, do student personnel services. Furthermore, these identical elements can be ascertained.

"5. The effectiveness of any student personnel services program in the last analysis rests upon scientific evidence and concrete facts rather than upon untried assumptions and unsupported personal opinions; hence, any such program should be subjected periodically to a thorough inventory."*

*Eric N. Backham, "The Need for Adequate Criteria When Evaluating College Student Personnel Programs," EDUCATIONAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL MEASUREMENT, 11:697.

Gordon Klopff suggests certain meaningful criteria for evaluating a student activities program. These include the following:

- "1. Basic Assumptions Concerning Student Activities
 - a. Activities should be considered a part of the educational program of the institution.
 - b. Activities programs should have an emphasis on those activities in which individuals can participate.
 - c. Activities should help develop students socially by offering opportunities to develop self-confidence, to feel a sense of belonging and a sense of security, to develop sound inter-personal relations, and to make wholesome adjustments to the other sex.
 - d. Activities should provide for the development of students' individual capabilities and talents.
 - e. Activities should develop cultural, vocational, and desirable recreational interests in students.
 - f. Activities should develop appreciation for and skills in democratic processes and should produce qualified and intelligent leaders.

- g. Activities should provide for the enrichment of the life of the individual through providing experiences having spiritual and ethical values.
- h. Activities should develop a sense of responsibility in the students for the welfare of their campus community, and the community of the state and the nation at large.
- i. Activities should be the concern of students, faculty and administration working together as an educational community.
- j. Activities should provide opportunities for students to develop responsibility through being given a share in the development of certain administrative and academic policies and programs.
- k. Activities programs should be developed in terms of the needs of the particular campus."

SUMMARY

Your Commission's report may serve to indicate the limited state of development in which evaluation takes place in most institutions today. We hope that by thus outlining the unsolved aspects of this question and problem of evaluation, we shall stimulate more careful thinking which will in turn ultimately produce written experiences helpful to all of us in finding answers to questions relative to the effectiveness of our services.

More specifically, it is our hope that the future deliberations of your Commission on Program and Practices of Evaluation might lead to the discovery and establishment of certain meaningful criteria by which student personnel services can be more adequately evaluated. It is further hoped that the efforts of this Commission may lead to the design and implementation of evaluative approaches and techniques more valid than those currently in use.

We will close the report with these recommendations:

- 1. That a new Commission on Program and Practices Evaluation be continued to study this important problem area.
- 2. That the new Commission center its attention on what are valid and relevant criteria, common to all institutions of higher learning, by which evaluation can be made.
- 3. That the new Commission also give consideration to those criteria which may be unique to different kinds of institutions -- that is, differences in size, religious orientation,

geographic location, curriculum content, type of student body, and unique objectives of each institution.

4. That the new Commission give thought to determining the proper weighting to be given to the various sources of evaluative judgments, including the following:

- a. Students
- b. Members of the faculty
- c. Parents
- d. President
- e. Deans and other administrators
- f. Public at large

The above groups should be further classified into those with direct experience with the services being evaluated, and those with only general hearsay acquaintance and knowledge.

5. The new Commission consider the problem of evaluation in the light of the demands made upon the institution by a changing society, of which the institution is a part. (There appears, for example, to have been a shift from an emphasis on the liberal arts per se to the provision of curricula providing training in a large variety of fields.)

6. That the new Commission consider the effects upon evaluation practices of the changing character of the student body, with respect to such matters as:

- a. Socio-economic level
- b. What the college is expected to produce for the students' benefit.
- c. The accelerated change from a regional to a national, and even an international, source of enrolled students.

7. Finally, that your Association endeavor to secure adequate funds for the collection and analysis of experiences and studies of the various aspects of evaluation, and, also, to enable the Commission to meet several times during the coming year for more exhaustive examination of the various aspects of this complicated and universally important problem.

In submitting this report, I should like to state that we were not able to meet together physically; therefore, this report was written through the courtesy of the U. S. mail and after we came here to this meeting. Dr. Gordon Klopff, of course, has not participated since he has been in Japan, and Dean Merrill Jarchow of Carleton, while he participated by mail, was not able

to be here. So if you like anything about the Commission report it is due to those of us who are present here. Thank you.
[Applause]

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Thank you, Ed. Is there discussion of the report?

DEAN NOWOTNY: I move the adoption of the report.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Is there discussion of the motion?

... The question was called for ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: All those in favor signify by the usual sign. Opposed. The motion is adopted.

I think it would be appropriate at this time if the Chair exercised the privilege of asking our old friend Scott Goodnight if he would just rise and let us know that he is here so that we can greet him. Scott. [Applause as he arose]

Past-President Wesley Lloyd has arrived, and we would like to greet him too. [Applause as he arose]

We are very happy to see our old friend Bill Blaesser. Bill. [Applause as he arose]

The next order of business, if we hope to conclude this portion of the program, would be to pick up where we left off last evening on the report of Commission I. The status of that, as you may remember, is that a motion was made for the adoption of Roman numeral 1 covering page 4 and part of 5, which motion was laid on the table at your direction. It has been suggested that in the event a vote is appropriate, whether it be this morning or this afternoon, that we use a simplified technique of institutional voting to see if we can more nearly conform to the constitutional requirements without going through the tedious process of a roll call. It is suggested, therefore, with your consent, that if and when a vote is taken we ask for an institutional vote by show of hands, and if there are more representatives here than one from a single institution, the senior representative would cast that one vote. Is that agreeable? [Cries of "Yes"] What is your pleasure with respect to Roman numeral 1? I will entertain a motion to remove this motion from the table in order to put it before us.

DEAN STONE: I so move, Mr. President.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Is there discussion? All those in favor signify by the usual sign. Opposed. The motion is before you. The motion which was made by Dean Thompson was for the adoption of Roman numeral I as specified. The motion is open for discussion. Is my assumption correct?

DEAN THOMPSON: I think the motion is before the house now. I would like to speak for a moment.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Go ahead.

DEAN THOMPSON: I made a motion to bring this assembly to grips with the question involved. I personally am opposed to the adoption of this section because I do not believe it represents in detail what this Association wishes to undertake.

In the first place I find among this group of Deans of Men a group of younger people who are increasingly finding themselves lost in this assembly. I am not a Drew Pearson, but I predict that unless this thing is defeated as it now stands, and we allow the thing to disseminate and become an organization into which women's organizations, or women's colleges can come, and it is thrown as wide open as this part I seems to indicate, that the effectiveness of this personnel group will eventually disappear; and along with that you have the development of a real Dean of Men's Association. That is the point I think we ought to think about before we go into this and vote on it.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: To clarify the parliamentary situation, if you take a motion from the table it is still before you; but regardless of that fact, being among friends, our purpose is to discuss this section, and if there is no objection the Chair is going to rule that Dean Thompson's motion is before us for discussion. If you are opposed to it, you can vote to defeat it. I think that will save time. Is there objection to that? The motion is before you for further discussion.

DEAN SHUTT: As one of the younger Deans that Dean Thompson is talking about, I have not been in this business too long but I would like to second what Dean Thompson has said. I am a member of a CPA, AGA and BBA and similar organizations. This was a unique organization. I could not stay last year to cast my ballot against the proposed change. Had I been there I certainly would have done so. I think I express the opinion of a great many of the younger Deans of Men.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Vic, as chairman of the Commission, do you wish to speak to this motion at this time, or later?

DEAN SPATHELF: I would be glad to speak to it now.

Last night Dean Stone made the motion to table action on this motion for the purpose, he told me, of insuring that we would have adequate time to consider the action and to become informed and discuss the action informally. I certainly think that this has been done, both at length in small groups and in larger groups, as I have observed it. Your Commission made this report as a unit. Last evening you took action to approve Roman numerals II, III, IV and V. For the point of perspective for a moment, if you will review that, No. II was action endorsing in principle the concept that we do not contemplate a merger with other organizations. No. III recognized in principle our relationship to other organizations as specialist organizations. No. IV recognized a clarification of our relationship to informal groups. No. V adopted in principle relationships to other professional organizations, including those not numbered among the personnel field but numbering those individuals who institutionally render either a special service or who act upon matters of institutional policy.

The early part of this report reviewed for you the implication of President Lloyd's address in 1951, centering its issue completely as to whether or not this organization was going to assume leadership responsibility in the student personnel field. I submit to you that if you look at the listing of groups on page 7 in the comprehensive report, this array of five groupings of organizations, you will recognize that many of them are (whether you like it or not) either making decisions in the personnel field or are individually and collectively trying to exert leadership in the personnel field, and I would refer you particularly to group 4, if for no other reason than to indicate that here is a problem of part of our dilemma at the present time.

Take the first group, for instance, your National Association of Foreign Student Advisers. The question is basically are they going to provide the leadership as a portion of the student personnel program, or are we as an association of people who carry primary responsibility going to exercise leadership to them and to the entire student personnel field?

I have been impressed, and I think you have, with the comprehensiveness of the other four Commission reports which have been before us. They represent basic concerns in the field of leadership and coordination and program development. If we are able to realize the potential in each of those Commission reports it will go a long way to provide leadership. The question then that remains to be answered is: Who is going to provide leadership? On the local campus who does your president or your administration expect to provide leadership in the field? Is this all who have primary responsibility in the personnel field, or is it

just a portion of the people? What will be the impact of leadership if a portion of the people in the student personnel field say, "We want to be the people who exert leadership," whereas another group or another array of individuals do not exert leadership? In the final analysis it is a question of whether all of those with whom we are working and have various degrees of leadership can work together to give leadership in the larger field of student personnel work so that the entire effort may have greater focus, meaning and impact for the benefit of the students.

Your Commission met this morning for breakfast and we looked this thing over again. On page 4 of the comprehensive report we made two suggestions, that in I-A, the last part of the sentence read: "... we must be prepared to receive as representatives to our Associations, should institutions so designate:" This was to clarify a question last evening. And in sub-item (c) to include "associate or assistant administrators in said schools."

In talking on behalf of the Commission for the adoption of this section, I submit to you that you are not voting on whether or not you are going to have an organization primarily for Deans of Men, or whether or not you are going to have women who assume or share primary responsibility; you are voting basically as to whether or not this organization is going to attempt to assume, through our best efforts, leadership in the personnel field. This is purely and simply the issue, and I would strongly urge its adoption from that vantage point.

DEAN WILLIAMSON: Mr. President, I never had the slightest desire to try to impose our experience in Minnesota on any other institution, believing as I do in the autonomy and diversity of institutions; but it has been of considerable difficulty to me in our own local institution because the gap that Vic outlined with respect to national leadership in this field has been so large, the void has been so large.

I do not like large conventions any more than anyone else. They are very uncomfortable. I am afraid, as long as we continue to have a large number of institutions we will have to put up with size the best we can. What disturbs me is the point that Vic made. The determination of my local program is being taken out of my hands and the hands of my staff, and I do not like it because it forces me into embarrassing situations of having to make local adjustments after national organizations have dictated, with the best of intentions, many factors which may not be appropriate locally and which certainly should not have been adopted without local consultation, such as is provided by this kind of a representative group.

I am heartily in favor of everything that the National Foreign Students Advisers Association has done, except that I would have liked to have been consulted a little bit ahead of time, particularly with respect to some of the things that have been imposed by the federal agencies of one sort or another, without any consultation on the local campuses. More and more we are called upon to do more and more services for the government without any consideration of the implications, budgetwise alone, and I would like to see some group such as those who are administratively responsible locally consulted once in a while about some of these national programs. I do not find that my foreign student adviser, as he goes to these national meetings, is always given very careful consideration or attention, and I would like to have such a group as this one, which bears the overall local administrative responsibility, make its wishes and consideration and thoughtful reactions felt in the formulation of national policy with regard to foreign students.

The same thing could be said with respect to Division 17 of the American Psychological Association, of which I am a member and of which I have been a president for two terms. Those of you who are in Division 17 may have noticed in the last Newsletter that I wrote an editorial, upon request, stating my point of view that Division 17 is doing a wonderful job of studying every aspect of counseling except the educational context in which counseling takes place. When a sub-committee of Division 7 formulates a set of ethics determining the ethics of the counselors on my staff, I would like to have some consideration of my peculiar needs and responsibilities, as an administrator in an institution, enter into the formulation of the ethics. I can give you a very simple example. If Division 17, without consultation with those of us who are administrators at least in the eyes of our president, formulates a principle of ethics that there shall be no exchange of confidential information, immediately you and I are going to bear the full responsibility as far as our president is concerned; and our special needs for keeping our president informed about many potentially explosive disciplinary situations is going not to weigh in the formulation of the ethics.

Now, Division 17 does not do this intentionally but, being composed of counselors, it does not consider the administrative responsibility and its effect upon a problem of ethics.

I have cited two illustrations of the effect of the absence of the national leadership which is so badly needed. I should like to see this group move into that area, and I think that I shall vote for this because it seems to me to be one important step in the direction of that important objective.

DEAN HAACK: I would like to make one comment that I think is pertinent. It seems to me, as I have talked to many of you about the issue here in the light of the feeling of the leadership need, that we are caught, as organizations always are in periods of transition, between something which we have known and liked and a challenge of responsibility which we also seek. In my own position, regardless of what my title happened to be, if I were going to represent my institution accurately, I think I should have to vote for this, because there is need, as I see it from the standpoint of my institution and others that I know, for this type of clarity that Ed is talking about. The institutions need it, and in my judgment are going to get it. They are going to get it by compounding specialist organizations if they do not get it from this group. I know of no other place to turn, because this group has represented (and as NADAM) the closest approximation to the individuals who carried the brunt of this thing. If we do not declare ourselves in that position, I think we are handicapping the positions of our institutions.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Unless you vote to the contrary, I would like to have this discussion run a while. There are a lot of attitudes about this, and this is the place to get them out. Let's not close it off in a hurry.

DEAN BALDWIN: In reading this over, I get the implication that while at this time we have had only men in the organization that if you interpret this the way I see it is coming, it is going to be a decision as to whether we take in women's colleges in this organization because they are the chief administrators in there. The question is going to come up before your Executive Committee, are you going to take in Vassar, are you going to take in Wellesley, and the other women's colleges, because they are the chief administrators of personnel in that group?

I think we ought to face that here, rather than pass it on to the Executive Committee as to whether they are going to accept these particular women's colleges. If you do, what is going to happen to the National Association of Deans of Women? Are we inviting them to come over? Will their organization disband and come in with ours? Do we go right from totally a men's organization into taking in women?

In reality, all the discussion I have had with men here is that they did not want to meet in the same place as the Deans of Women; they wanted to be as far away as they could. Now we are going to the opposite extreme. You said last night there was nothing in there that said there could not be women in the organization before. It was called a Dean of Men organization. [Discussion off the record] I think we should discuss this on the floor here as to whether we want to face up to these issues.

I think we ought to know just what we are doing. It was my impression last year, when this went through, that it was called NASPA, to take in the Deans of Administration, the Deans of Student Affairs, and Deans of Students, and so forth that NADAM did not define. That was my understanding when the thing went through. The comment was made "this may imply the women", but if we thought we would have women, we would have had a few here this year because technically we could have had. I do not want the thing to go by without some discussion on that particular topic.

DEAN MATTHEWS: I would like to raise the question, for my benefit and for the benefit of the "freshmen" who are here (some 20 or 25), as to what would happen if this motion failed? Exactly what would be the status, under the constitution, if this motion fails? As I understand it, Vassar could come in, any four year women's college would be eligible. Assuming the motion fails, under the constitution aren't these schools eligible for membership at the present time?

PRESIDENT KNAPP: There is no question about it.

DEAN MATTHEWS: All right then, by the same token, if the motion fails and these schools are eligible for membership, aren't the designated representatives eligible to come to this meeting?

PRESIDENT KNAPP: There is no question about it. That is what I tried to say last night. There is no question about the constitutional status of the thing at the moment.

DEAN PELLETT: I would like to have this question answered: What are we trying to legislate out of American education, the associations which have already been enumerated in section 4; and by what power, in voting for this motion, will we be able to say to any member of our staffs as they go to these various meetings, can they go, or can't they? Can they go, but not vote for such things as an ethical code? I think that should be answered.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Will you answer that, Vic? Did you get the question?

DEAN SPATHELF: I will restate the question. I think the comment that was just made involves both a question and a comment. What is your question precisely?

DEAN PELLETT: What is to prevent members of our staff from going to other association meetings and passing resolutions

which affect their group?

DEAN SPATHELF: I think nothing at all. Section 3 of this report, which you approved last night, indicates that there are specialist organizations, and there always will be specialist organizations, and that we should encourage our staff people to go there. In reference to your initial comment, I do not think it is a matter that we are "legislating out of existence" any professional organization. In fact, your action on Roman numeral III says just the opposite.

There is one point of reference that ought to be clear, I think, that there has been no organization that singly can be a point of reference as composed of individuals who are on the local campus primarily concerned with program direction, and I think the action of some of these groups on various matters is a natural action as a result of that kind of void. I am sure that the good will of people and their professional integrity is such that were there such a natural point of reference as an organization composed primarily of those people who assumed leadership on local campus that there would be the kind of communication and inter-change of ideas, or ideas that would not create this gulf that is presently here where an organization just takes action without consultation with anybody else. I do not think that this would be the kind of thing that you, in a responsible position on campus, would tolerate very long: If a group of your counselors decided to get together and decided that they were going to enact institutional policy without discussion or consultation with you. On the other hand, if there were not that kind of individual with whom to consult as the individual head, it may be a natural development.

SECRETARY TURNER: Mr. Chairman, may I speak to this just a minute. I do not know that I can do any clarifying on this, but perhaps I can speak pretty frankly and pretty much from the heart. I do not think there is any man in the room -- unless it is Scott Goodnight or Don Gardner -- who had a greater affection for NADAM than I did. I do not think there is anybody in the room more troubled over what we have been forced into -- and I say "forced into" advisedly -- in the past three or four years.

Actually the choice that is before us right now is this: Either we can split this organization and form an association of "top flight administrators", if you want to, and then there will have to be the formation of an organization of Deans of Men and an organization of Deans of Women; or else we try to keep what we have and retain the Deans of Men, if they are designated by their institution, and retain the Deans of Students and Directors of Personnel Programs, and keep it in one organization.

To me, that is what we are trying to do. We are trying to do two things: Keep what we had, but we are trying to meet an impossible situation.

Under a strict interpretation of our former setup, I was out. I was no longer Dean of Men, and I had reached the place where the president asked me, "What are you going to that meeting for? You are not the Dean of Men any more." And I know that all over the country Deans of Students were faced with that very problem, and they would be the people who had been the Deans of Men and who had worked through the years and tried to hold the Deans of Men's organization together and made it what many of us thought (and still think) is the best organization of its kind in the country.

That is what is before us right now. Either we try to keep what we have had, and gain some things, or else I think we are at the crossroads of splitting this group which we have all loved so much, and having the smaller group of Deans of Students and Directors that have to form a new organization, and the Deans of Men form a separate organization of their own. I do not want that. I think it is a terrific bogey-man. I do not think it is nearly as serious. Actually I think we are faced with the problem of maybe having a few women come to our organization. The Deans of Women have not voted to disband. They are not going to. They could not qualify to include Deans of girls from the kindergarten, if you want to take it that far, from their organization. They could not qualify at all. But if the institution says it wants to send the Dean of Women to our organization, there is nothing we can do. I do not fear we are going to have many women coming into it. The nearest thing we had to it this year was Blair's successor at Temple University, but she said she did not want to be the first woman to come. I think that that may be the attitude.

Ted's question was, could Deans of the College, or Deans of Women, or Deans of Student Personnel in Women's colleges apply for membership. I think if an application came from Vassar tomorrow, the Executive Committee could not do anything else but approve it. I think the question before us is, can we go along sympathetically and try at this stage to make an advance and at the same time retain the thing we had; or, are we going to split it wide open, because that is the thing that faces us right now. Actually there is no change in our constitution. This is a question of interpretation. I say this to you very much from my heart because no one thought more of NADAM than I did, and no one felt worse than I did when the old name died last year. It means a good deal to me on the question of time and affection.

DEAN HOWARD HOOGESTEGGER (Lake Forest College): Fred, your president asked, "Why are you going to the Dean of Men's meeting?" I am the Dean of Men. I went to my president and he said, "What the hell are you doing going to a Student Personnel Meeting?" I think his point is well taken. I feel very much the problem this man raised of the small institutions. In spite of all that, I think with all honesty that the women are going to be in it. We might as well recognize it.

I have infinite faith in NASPA and its ability to maintain an informal relationship. I hope that some of the local state meetings may solve the problem of getting together as a group of men. But I would express a difference with this gentleman over here. I think that in the long run we have nothing but the best to look forward to.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: If you will pardon just one comment from the Chair, I would like to say that my school is a small school. My Dean of Men is my Personnel Administrator. He will come to NASPA meetings under this new deal. I do not see any difficulty. Deans of Men are Personnel Administrators.

DEAN GEARY EPPLEY (University of Maryland): Not to confuse the issue here -- I know it was confused to me until you explained it this morning. In this first "A" which was changed; it looked like we haven't much to vote on because it is all set. In other words, it is not according to name or anything else; it is in accordance with the provision of the constitution. It looks like we are trying now to decide something which we decided last year. It is just an interpretation of the constitution.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: There is no question that what this Commission has done was to attempt to interpret the changes made last year. May I read one sentence from what you added to the Statement of Purpose last year, from the constitution: "The institutions which are the constituent members of this Association are represented by those who are primarily concerned with the administration of Student Personnel programs in colleges and universities of the United States."

As I understand it, the purpose of what we are debating right now is to spell out who are these people who are primarily concerned with the administration of student personnel in the colleges of these United States. That is very correct to be the issue.

DEAN BISHOP: I call for the question.

... Cries of "Question" ...

DEAN EPPLEY: I would like to make one suggestion that we add a paragraph (e), that Deans of Men will be particularly welcome, [Laughter] so we don't leave them out in the cold.

DEAN GEORGE H. RYDEN (Oklahoma City University): I would like someone here to explain to me how this organization differs from the American College Personnel Association.

SECRETARY TURNER: There is one basic difference, and that is they have individual memberships there, and this has institutional memberships, with the representative designated by the institution.

DEAN PAUL MacMINN (University of Oklahoma): Another basic difference is that this organization is confined to educational institutions, whereas ACPA has membership open to personnel workers in business, industry and other allied areas.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: One other difference, to clarify this -- I have been a member of the Executive Committee of ACPA for two years -- is that ACPA is made up of many types of specialists; it includes counselors, psychologists of various sorts, placement people, all kinds of specialists, including some administrators. The very assumption we made last year, in all the discussion of the changes we were making, was that the time had come when there needed to be an organization of administrators.

DEAN STONE: Mr. President, this may do violence to Paul Pitman's concept of courage -- I believe in courage and as an old Navy warhorse, I also believe in strategy. As I read this excellent report of the Commission I was wondering whether we would not be wise if we eliminated from the formal document, and certainly from that which is circulated, the thinking of the Commission in justification of paragraph 1. As I see it, paragraph one re-emphasizes, re-states, the policy which has been spelled out in the constitution of this Association, and I believe under certain circumstances it is well to let sleeping dogs lie. I feel myself that by incorporating this in the report of the committee as a formal acceptance by this body and circulating this throughout other educational institutions, that we do raise sleeping dogs, which, if we do not raise them, may lie quietly.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: I am reluctant to shut off debate and will not do so unless you so wish. Are you ready for the vote?

DEAN GOODNIGHT: I would like to support the suggestion that was made here a while ago that you add in a paragraph that Deans of Men are particularly welcome; Deans of Women and females are particularly unwelcome. [Laughter]

DEAN STONE: May I offer as an amendment, the approval of paragraph 1, only of this section one of the report, in so far as conference action is concerned. That is the paragraph at the top of the page which precedes the letter "A".

PRESIDENT KNAPP: You want Roman numeral I without any sub-divisions?

DEAN STONE: That is right.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: The amendment, as the Chair understands it, is to eliminate anything following Roman numeral I; eliminate all subdivisions under Roman numeral I. Is there a second to the motion to amend?

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Is there any discussion on the amendment?

DEAN SPATHELF: I would like to discuss this. Last night I participated in several discussions around the hall, and the burden of those discussions was something like this: Let's reiterate that we agree that the name National Association of Student Personnel Administrators is the thing we want to advertise for its psychological impact in the present situation. Then let's write our own definitions which will keep out, as a result of not saying anything, the people we do not want.

This was advanced as a matter of strategy. This was advanced as a matter of compromise to get over a difficulty. I do not want to read into Dean Stone's remarks the answer I am going to give right now, which I gave last night, but I do want it as a point of reference for all of our thinking. I was impressed in the talk of our Chaplain friend at our opening session Wednesday night on the emphasis of the development of integrity and moral responsibility. I was impressed with the comments that Mr. Pitman made this morning to the same end. I think there is one obligation that is upon us at all times, and that is to be absolutely clear that any matter of integrity, of intent, and of honesty is not beclouded in any fashion.

I think this applies in this situation. I think we have a fundamental issue of integrity to indicate what we are, or what we are not, and not allow any convenient misunderstanding or misinterpretation to compromise our positions as people who must operate on the basis of integrity, honesty and moral responsibility by the very nature of the work that we are associated with.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Is there further discussion on the

amendment to the motion?

... The question was called for ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Does everybody have a copy of this in your hands so you will know what you are voting on? If you adopt this amendment, the motion will then read as follows:

"I. This Commission agrees that the new name, 'The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators' and the enlargement of our organizational purposes places emphasis on its role as an organization of 'principal administrators' of student personnel work on a national basis. The action of our Association last year places on the organization the responsibility to accept such 'principal administrators' in student personnel work as institutions may designate."

Let us vote on this amendment on the basis of hands, please, one vote per institution. All those in favor of the amendment please signify as indicated.

SECRETARY TURNER: Gentlemen, it is very hard to count from here. If those of you who are voting will please stand, then count and sit down, it will be much easier.

... The vote on the amendment was taken; those voting for, 34; against, 62 ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: The amendment is lost.

... The question was called for ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: The question on which you are voting at this time is the original motion, but I would like to ask if you would give unanimous consent to have it amended in terms of Vic's language, which simply clarified some confusion and did not change at all the meaning of this paragraph. Unanimous consent to have those changes is indicated. All those in favor of the adoption of this motion please rise. This is the main motion to adopt section I on page 4, and running half way through page 5.

... The vote on the motion was taken; voting for, 74; against 19 ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: The motion is adopted, 74 to 19.
[Applause]

DEAN WILLIAMS: I move a vote of appreciation for the Commission's work.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: All those in favor signify by the usual sign. Opposed. It is adopted.

SECRETARY TURNER: Mr. Chairman, I think we are remiss now if we do not instruct either the Executive Committee, or the Conference goes on record as to the continuation of these Commissions, because we passed rather rapidly this important Commission III on which a great deal of work was gone into.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Something is coming from the Resolutions about it. Fred took some of the words out of my mouth. I was just going to confirm this, that as we close this I know I am speaking for you when I say to the members of these five commissions that we have appreciated the very high quality of program that has resulted from hours and hours of work on their part. Our apparently hurried adoption of the report is in no way a reflection of a casual acceptance of what they had to say. I would like to have you indicate some support for that view in the appropriate manner. [Applause]

... Announcements ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: We are still going to be on a tight schedule. The program this noon is a grand one and will need all the time we can give it. Our main business session must start promptly at three o'clock. So would you cooperate by moving directly from here to the place where we have the picture taken so that things can proceed.

... The Conference recessed at eleven thirty-five o'clock ...

FRIDAY LUNCHEON SESSION

April 4, 1952

The Luncheon Session convened at one-fifteen o'clock, Dean Arno Nowotny, University of Texas, presiding.

CHAIRMAN NOWOTNY: Although some of you may not have finished your luncheon as yet, because of the urgency of time I think we can start this meeting now. I have been informed that Dean Rollins is reportedly doing very well in the hospital. If there is any further report on his condition, we will let you know.

I made a few notes on the program. This word "integrity" has been kicked around a lot, and I remember what Will Rogers said one time, "An honest politician is one that can be bought and stays bought." [Laughter] When I listened to that excellent report by Ed Williamson -- and he always does an excellent job -- I was reminded that he evaluated my campus for me as a consultant. He talked about evaluating Deans, and I am reminded about the fact that if I had been on my campus twenty-five years ago at two o'clock in the morning and met a couple of students they probably would have said, "I wonder what the Dean is doing up at two o'clock in the morning?" Now if I met any student at two o'clock in the morning, they would say, "I wonder what the hell Old Shorty is doing up at this time of night!" [Laughter] Times have changed; they evaluate differently. [Laughter]

I have gotten a big thrill out of Juan Reid's hospitality and this great weather he provided. Us country boys down in Texas are not used to anything like this. I was born in a little town, a section of which they called "Billy Goat Hill." We didn't like that so we changed it to "Angora Heights." [Laughter] In the plains of West Texas it's pretty dry; we really need rain. We had a prayer meeting out there not long ago to pray for rain. An old country boy said, "It won't do you any good so long as the wind is out of the east." It's so dry there that even the beavers don't give a damn. [Laughter]

I was supposed to be up here today to introduce your presiding officer of this meeting, and that's something. Here's a man presiding, but you have to have somebody introduce him. As I told you on the opening morning when you were nice enough to give me a spot on the program to respond to the Colorado welcome, the first time I ever saw Scott Goodnight was twenty-four years ago, about fifty miles north of here, at Boulder at Harry Carlson's school. There was never a greener young man who ever came to a

convention. I was wearing a straw hat, and Scott Goodnight threw a snowball at me. I didn't know you weren't supposed to wear a straw hat in Colorado in the springtime. We'd been wearing them for thirty days in Texas. Yet he made me, a green youngster, feel at home. He has done that through the years; and to introduce a guy like that I made a few notes. I'd like to read a little note from my wife that came this morning. Here are some instructions she gave me, "Throw some snowballs at Don and Peg Gardner; kiss Trudy and Scott for me too." I didn't kiss Scott, but I kissed Trudy twice. I am reading this note because Scott and Trudy have been a great team. That is one of the traits of a great administrator. In my humble opinion that could be added to the Commission's study.

He has known his subject matter. He has some skills that he has learned in the hard school, as well as in formal school. He has had a sort of divine dissatisfaction not to be satisfied with the way things are being done but to continue to try to change and improve.

Then he has another trait that I think is important for an administrator. He has a skill in picking subordinates. Bill Blaeser and Chuck Dollar, two of his boys, grew up in his office and there are not two finer men in our business than those two boys. He has a skill of picking good men, and that is a skill of a real administrator.

I do not want to get emotional, but in my opinion, these forty years that Scott Goodnight gave to his school and the many years he gave to this Association have been the greatest things that ever happened to it. I think only God and his censors can evaluate what that has meant to all of us and to the institutions we represent. Justice Holmes one time said that a "great scholar is a thinker who realizes that long after he is gone and forgotten men and institutions will be moving to the measure of his thought and influence. I would hate to tell you how many times, way down in my little office in Texas when it got pretty dark and lonesome and I didn't know any answers, when I was afraid even to dictate a letter and I had to write a letter in longhand to this man on my right, and I got a letter in return from this fellow. You can understand how I feel about the greatest man I know.

So the man who is going to preside at this luncheon today is a grand old man, and young as ever; that rascal and that rebel, Scott Goodnight.

... Applause as Scott Goodnight assumed the Chair ...

CHAIRMAN GOODNIGHT: Thank you, Shorty. Members of NASPA and MA: [Laughter and applause] These Texas boys are very much given to exaggeration. Shorty, I would be willing to settle for about 20 per cent of the credits you have been trying to bestow upon me, but I am very grateful to you.

An example of Texan exaggeration came my way the other day. Some folks were looking through the great Carlsbad Caverns and one lady remarked to the tall, gangling individual who stood next to her, "They say these are the largest caverns in the world." In a beautiful drawl he said, "No ma'm; we have bigger ones in Texas." "Oh," she said, where are they?" "Well, I don't know just yet. You see, we ain't discovered them yet." [Laughter]

To come to the subject on which we are going to be instructed today, it is a most interesting one and we have three very fine speakers to give us the low-down on the various aspects of it. I think it was Robert Ingersoll who said that the time to have a good time is now; the place to have a good time is here, and the way to have a good time is to make somebody else have a good time. I think that is what our three speakers are going to do for us. We are going to have a good time listening to these gentlemen on this subject of foreign students and student exchanges.

The first speaker comes from the University -- well, up at Wisconsin we don't have many championships but recently we have gone on a binge of appointing Vice-Presidents. We have three now, and I thought maybe we might successfully claim the "veep" championship of the middle west. But no, I inquired of Bob Strozier and they have four in Chicago and there goes that dream. The speaker I am about to present to you comes from the best be-veeped and best be-deaned institution in the mid-west, probably, Mr. Robert Strozier, who is going to speak on the first phase of the foreign student exchange. [Applause]

DEAN STROZIER: Thank you. When I talked to Scott Goodnight this morning he asked me what I was going to talk about, and I started in giving the title of the U. S. Commission on Education Exchange and so forth. We got a little complicated so I told him I would tell you why I am making this report. It is really a report instead of a speech.

I went on last spring as a consultant with the Department of State, the Division of the Exchange of Persons, and was asked to visit some schools in the United States during the fall-- as many as I would have time to visit -- to attempt to assess the attitudes (general attitudes) on the part of the administrative officers of the institutions concerning the whole question of

educational exchange, at the professorial and the student level.

Most of you know I think that when the Fulbright program was adopted, the Smith-Mundt, and other programs, the Congress voted that there should be a Commission on Educational Exchange which would report directly to the Congress on the operation of all these programs. These members were: Mr. Morrill, the President of the University of Minnesota, Chairman; Mr. Fred of Wisconsin; Mr. Branscomb of Vanderbilt, and others.

They are supposed to serve to assess attitudes, to look over at close range the operation of all these programs, and report to the Congress all of the official reports -- for example, official reports of Fulbright are channeled through them to the Congress. Mr. Fred, the President of Wisconsin, was directly responsible for my making these trips and making this report. I am giving the report today as I gave it in January to the United States Commission at the conclusion of these trips which were made during the fall quarter.

In the course of the fall quarter I visited the Universities of Arkansas, California, California at Los Angeles, Columbia, Harvard, University of Missouri, University of North Carolina, Radcliffe, San Francisco State College, University of Texas, University of Utah. I think anyone would be conscious of the fact that there are not enough small private schools listed here. I have attempted, informally, to check with them, but it was impossible to include all of the schools that I should have liked to include.

The vision of the educational potential implicit in the international exchange of students, scholars and professors, has fired the imaginations of American educators. It seems to be understood everywhere -- and it is reassuring to know that it is understood -- that ideas are not, and cannot be circumscribed by geographic or political boundaries. The foreign students who have been visiting our country under special programs during the last few years have been enthusiastically received. Their work has been favorably evaluated.

But the impression remains that the tremendous stimulation of imaginations about the program has not been matched by an imaginative administrative implementation of the program. Indeed, one even finds the enthusiasm about the idea of exchange frequently dampened, even frustrated, by the unwieldy administrative wheels which operate in the area.

The institutions visited feel that the best utilization of their resources has at times been frustrated by the necessity

for quick planning and execution. There is a trend among the institutions to refuse special programs unless there is opportunity for long-range planning for the use of facilities and resources. Such long-range planning presumes a survey of existing facilities and resources and some indication of when and how these resources may be called upon.

The need for centralized information services is not paralleled by a need for centralized direction on the problems of foreign students. There is feeling that an information-gathering center should be established but should not be governmental, although it is realized its relations with the government would necessarily be close. The American Council of Education would probably be satisfactory for this service.

Only 10 per cent of the foreign students in this country are related to the Institute of International Education. The remaining 90 per cent present frequent problems concerning immigration, exchange, and special problems of health, to which the institutions, for lack of knowledge or funds cannot properly address themselves. The special handling of the Chinese students greatly alleviated the difficulties of those to whom the emergency program applied, but the problems of those not covered by that program have been great.

State institutions are particularly embarrassed by an inability to use their funds in emergencies to alleviate critical student financial problems. Very serious problems arise among those who underestimate their expenses, those who state untruths concerning their financial situations when they apply, and those who are caught in the tenuous web of international finance and exchange.

The institutions have met these problems haphazardly. Some schools secure part-time employment for these students, supplementing this income with loans and gifts. Ideally, it is agreed, a fund should be established to cover these unexpected difficulties. The hazards of announcing even a modest fund are immediately apparent, however, to even the most inexperienced administrator.

Most schools are very critical of the screening done abroad in many areas as it applies to knowledge of English, and often, health.

There is a conscientious effort among the institutions to meet the housing and orientation problems presented by foreign students. These efforts have been moderately successful. The schools feel a definite need for guidance on the related problems.

The success of some of the orientation centers conducted during the summer suggests possibilities for the future. Even the extension of this plan, well-executed, however, would serve only as a step in the solution of the larger problem. Intelligent orientation, not paternalistic guidance, is needed on all campuses, even on those who feel with some smugness that they have no problems in this respect.

The necessity for an adviser for foreign students has been recognized in most of the institutions. In those schools where the adviser to foreign students is not a part of the general service-area of the school, administrative disorganization and personality clashes are inevitable. But the centralized clearing-house effect of these offices is limited for the 90 per cent of the foreign students present in this country independently. Although the students may get to the adviser with their problems, they frequently find the adviser, for the want of information or money, cannot cope with their difficulties.

Among the standard problems which ultimately must be solved by the concerted work of many thoughtful people in this field are: overcoming the language barriers to study; synchronization of the limited time most foreign students can spend in this country with the time required to take degrees in institutions; the measurement of the performance of foreign students who must necessarily draw upon very different backgrounds; coping with the problem of the foreign student who wishes to remain in this country permanently. NAFSA is grappling with these problems.

The following recommendations were made as a basis of the report:

First, that the Department of State initiate a survey of the institutions of higher learning in this country to determine the available resources and facilities for special programs for all governmental agencies involved, and that the Department make every effort to inform the institutions well in advance of plans for special projects.

Second, that a centralized Information Bureau be established to accumulate and disseminate data growing from the relations of institutions in this country with institutions abroad. This Bureau would assist in the evaluation of foreign universities and their transcripts, and in the expansion of the information program abroad now executed on a modest scale through our Information centers, where they exist.

On the basis of this second recommendation, a meeting has been called by the Commission in Washington on Friday of next week, the 11th of April with many of the agencies and the

Institute of International Education, the ACE, the U. S. Office of Education, the Ford Foundation, and others interested, to discuss this proposal.

Third, that the Institute of International Education be encouraged to broaden its affiliation with the foreign students in this country. The services of the Institute for the modest number of students it assists is exemplary; its reports good, as far as they go. A mere directory of the students in this country is of small advantage. It is not enough. The present administrative policies of the Institute are dispelling the resentment formerly felt by the institutions against a possessiveness toward persons whose papers had been processed by the Institute. There is room for much clarification, however, in the Institute's thinking about its role in the foreign student area. If and when the Institute commits itself primarily to the idea of service to foreign students, progress will be faster. The establishment of Institute centers in Chicago, Denver, San Francisco, Houston, Atlanta, and elsewhere is a step in the right direction. Abroad and at home, the claims of the Institute have often been more extensive than its resources justified. Policy-making in this field must be shared by the Institute with the many other important agencies operative.

Fourth, that the Department of State recognize the extreme importance for promptness in all its affairs with educational institutions. Most questions which arise in this field require the prompt and efficient assembling of information, or decisive statements of plans and policies.

Fifth, that a health insurance plan be made available for all foreign students, preferably through I.I.E. At present most institute-related students pay fees for health service at institutions in addition to the policy in force by the institution. A broad policy covering the student while traveling, during vacations, and supplementing the hospitalization provided by schools in this country would be to the great advantage of the student and his school.

Sixth, that schools attempt to devise a certificate for recognizing a minimum of one year's creditable academic work for students who cannot be degree candidates. (For some time the University of North Carolina has done this, and done it very effectively; and I am very happy to report that in the last two months the University of Chicago has given official sanction to the granting of a certificate for the completion of a year's work to these people who cannot be degree candidates.)

Seventh, that the screening abroad by representatives

of our country be done with greater skill, care, and comprehension of the import of errors in this work.

Eighth, that all institutions, private and public, strive toward procuring far greater funds for scholarships for deserving foreign students. [Applause]

CHAIRMAN GOODNIGHT: Thank you, Dean Strozler. With your permission we will reverse the order of the next two addresses, and will be addressed now by Dr. Cherrington, a gentleman who has been a profound student of international relations for many years and in many capacities. He is a former chancellor of the University of Denver, and has taught and written extensively in this particular field. He is the instituter, one might say, of the cultural relations activities of the Department of State, and is now a consultant of the Institute of International Relations. I take great pleasure in introducing Dr. Ben Cherrington of the University of Denver, who will now address you. [Applause]

DR. BEN CHERRINGTON (Director, Denver and Rocky Mountain Regional Office, Institute of International Education): Mr. Chairman and Friends: One of the many pleasures that I am having in being your guest here is the unexpected one of meeting Harry Pierson. Harry Pierson was one of the first officers of the Cultural Relations Department in the Department of State, and is a charter member so far as official participation in exchange of persons is concerned in this country. Harry was assigned at once to that area of International Cultural Relations having to do with exchange of persons and I suppose there is no one in the country who is more expert than he.

I have been hoping for an opportunity such as I have at this moment, as a private citizen, to pay tribute to you men and your colleagues who are not here today.

The first item of business we had before us when we started the Division of Cultural Relations was at the Buenos Aires convention for the exchange of two students and one professor. That was symbolic because at the very heart of our cultural program of our government, from that time to this, has been the exchange movement of people. We looked across the country to see what we might find, and we found, apart from the excellent, the superb International Houses in three or four of the centers, and excellent advisory work carried on in a few large universities, that by and large the foreign students were left to shift for themselves. All too frequently the reports came to us of students who had been residents in the United States and had gone with attitudes of bitterness and resentment toward all things American.

We lent every support we could unofficially to efforts to call attention to the importance of providing advisory services to the foreign students.

That was only thirteen years ago. As a matter of fact, in actual practice, it was only twelve years ago, Harry, and last year I had the pleasure of meeting with the advisers and there were some 300 of them in Denver at their national meeting. I am told there are literally hundreds of faculty members giving full or part time now to the advising and counseling of foreign students. That is something for which I think all citizens ought to be profoundly grateful, and it is an achievement to which I think the greatest credit goes to you gentlemen and your colleagues.

I hasten to add what you yourselves are adding in your own minds, namely that that is only a beginning. We are not doing what we need to do, and intend to do in this matter of advisory services for foreign students. The oldest private institution which at that time was engaging in exchange of students and professors was the Institute of International Education, and it was quite logical therefore that foundations, and the government also, would turn to it to assist in the administration of this program.

As you know, since the World War, the volume of exchange of persons has increased enormously and the demand upon the Institute of International Education for services have correspondingly increased, so the Institute finds itself at the moment in the process of a radical reorganization. Every effort is being made at headquarters to improve methods and set up new machinery for more effective services. There is a vast distance still to go, but I know you will all be patient and cooperative in the effort to make the Institute measure up to its opportunity.

One of the features of the expanding program of the Institute that Dr. Strozier has just referred to is the establishment of five regional offices to bring the services closer to the field of operation. Louise Wright is Director of the office in Chicago. Miss Harriet Eliel, well known on the Pacific Coast, is Director of the San Francisco office. Tom Southerland has just been established as Director of the office in Houston, Texas. I am acting as the organizing director of the office in Denver, Colorado. Before long we hope to open an office in Atlanta, Georgia.

By and large, there are two functions, as we see it, that these regional offices will perform. The first is the function of an information and service center. We want to have our little staffs available to the local campuses. The intention is

that every student who is under the auspices of the IIE shall be advised each year at least once. That will not be all. We hope we will find ways and means whereby the personnel from these Regional Offices can be of assistance to the other foreign students who are here and also through conferences with you people and with administrative officers help to improve the general tone and effectiveness of the program on the local campus.

Miss Foster, who has been giving her time to visiting the campuses in our Region has I think seen every IIE-related student in the states of this Region.

The other aspect of the program has to do with distinguished visitors and leaders, specialists and trainees, who are coming to this country in vast numbers, as you all know. Experience has demonstrated that it is impossible for officers in Washington or in New York to adequately provide a schedule for people who are going to travel across America, and the result has been that far too often these tours have been something like a grand tour of America, the kind of tours that you and I took when we made our first trip to Europe, and that of course is not the purpose of the visit of these people. So the Regional offices are organizing panels of committees, of citizens, representing all interests in the professions and the vocations. As the individual is about to approach a Regional Office those citizens who have comparable interests to those of the impending visitor are alerted and they serve as hosts, seeing to it that he meets the people that he would like to meet, and sees the institutions that it will be profitable for him to see.

In other words, this opens the door for the American people to come on in and do something in a very practical way to further international relations of the right type. It is the sort of thing that the American people can do in their sleep. It is the most natural thing in the world for any normal American to be host to a friend. We are finding, as you have already found I am sure, that it is an indirect way and perhaps one of the most effective indirect ways of developing world-mindedness. Perhaps the intensity of this world-mindedness derives from the very fact that it is a concomitant. The individual is asked only to be host to a visitor from abroad, but if it is well done as a rule that develops ties of friendship at least to correspond. It opens and widens the horizons of the American citizen.

I say these are the two major functions of these Regional Offices. We do not regard ourselves as being apart from you, individually or your organization. I hope you will not think me presumptuous when I say that we feel that we are members with you. Indeed, there is no reason for our being except that

we cooperate with you. We would like to have you feel as we would like to feel, that we are on your team, and that we solicit and covet your counsel and criticisms and suggestions so that we can feel our way into increasing effectiveness in the services which these Regional Offices may be able to render you on the local campus.

May I close by issuing to all of you a most hearty invitation to visit the new headquarters when next you are in New York City. We have just purchased a wonderful old mansion on Fifth Avenue at the corner of 67th and Fifth Avenue. At last we will have an international center that can be a sort of way-spot for these international students in transit from their home to your campus. [Applause]

CHAIRMAN GOODNIGHT: Thank you, Dr. Cherrington. You have listened to a very able report from the Department of State; now to another on the organization, the Regional Offices, and their work; and for a third report we are going to have Dean Wesley Lloyd of Brigham Young University discuss the student personnel activities in actual practice in Japan. This work, if I am rightly informed, is under the auspices of the Army, with the cooperation of other educational institutions here. General Matthew Ridgway is very much personally interested in the work that is going on over there. So we are going to ask Dean Lloyd to discuss Japanese University institutes on student personnel relations. Dean Lloyd. [Applause]

DEAN WESLEY P. LLOYD (Brigham Young University; General Director, Counseling and Guidance Center, Kyoto, Japan): A few short months ago I had little idea that I would have the opportunity of renewing again the friendships of this Association for this year. I had seen a rather vast body of water as I went from San Francisco to Tokyo and I knew that my swimming ability was not quite equal to that kind of a trip. When later I received an invitation to return, I began to realize what the last fifteen years of associations with men here can mean to a person who is working on a year's program.

In fact, through sheer habit I had learned to look forward to these sessions as a type of spiritual refreshment. Before speaking to the subject announced, I should like to recognize the exceptional contributions of many of you here to student personnel work in our country, and the contributions which we make to one another. It is rather easy for us to get discouraged and to decide that we are not getting along very fast. To those who may feel that way, I should like to invite you to go to some other country for a short time and to see what happens in contrast, for in this contrast we will see a picture that will make us more appreciative of the things which have happened here among us.

I bring you the greetings today of the people in Japan who are interested not only in the work there, but in the meetings of the professional associations here. I speak of General Matthew Ridgway and Colonel D. R. Nugent, who are directly responsible for much of the work that is going on. Those people are greatly concerned about what shall happen there following the occupation, and they are hopeful that some of these informal relations between professional associations will build to a substantial relationship so that there will be a friendship continue which is now in evidence there toward the American people.

While on that subject, I should say for the occupation that we have found nothing but fine relationships existing between the people of Japan and the occupation forces. That does not mean that there have not been some misunderstandings, but that in a project with such potential for misunderstanding there has been a minimum of such occurrences.

It seems almost impossible to me that under an army of occupation a group of specialists could be asked to go to Japan and not be told exactly what to do. If I remembered the history of occupations correctly, I remembered a history in which people are told exactly how to promote something. Think something of our surprise then when we were told in reference to this problem, "It is your jobs to study the need of Japanese universities and to make recommendations in reference to your studies." With that kind of a charter we seemed to proceed with very little to stop us except ourselves.

I bring greetings from the professional associations that have been established among student personnel workers there during the institutes, and also of the Dean of Students organization in Japan. They disbanded because their memberships were individual rather than institutional, and when they got together they were more concerned about talking about their salaries and how much was not being given to them by way of remuneration. It is my understanding that the presidents got together and said, "We do not need to support such arguments with the money of the universities," and in taking away the travel funds it pretty well did major things to the national phase of the organization. I congratulate NASPA on institutional memberships of a kind which keep it in healthy order.

Now, if I can take you for a brief visit to Japan -- and by the way, do not think we are going to have a travelogue. This morning I was racing along in rather high spirits until I struck this building, thinking that I would have things my own way and could say things about Japan in a very superlative manner and before I had been here five minutes at least two of you came

here and started talking Japanese to me. I thought that would be rather hard on the superlatives I was going to use and thought I had better be realistic in the things I would present.

In reference to the beginning of the project I should say to you, so we will know something of the basis there, that certain visitors from Japanese Universities came to America and observed that in the spirit of the educative process in higher education we had something here that may be of value to the universities of Japan. That idea bore some fruit. It was taken back to their home country. It received the immediate support of officials of the occupation and the educational agencies in our own country were asked to cooperate and give some help to the establishment of a project for Japanese university student personnel services.

At this time I want to pay tribute to the work of the Advisory Committee, the American Council on Education, the U. S. Office of Education and the cooperative agencies that worked in the early planning to establish the Institute. I should remind you that the Institute is an organization in which one faculty member from each of the universities of Japan is appointed to attend a three-months Institute. These Institutes are in three locations at three different times. In the autumn quarter the Institute was held at Kyoto University, and the faculty representatives of all the institutions in that area came for the work of the Institute. We then moved to Kushi University, and the one-third of the southern part of Japan's institutions then sent their faculty representatives. The next Institute will open on the 21st of this month in Tokyo, and at that institution faculty representatives of the remaining institutions of the entire country will be there taking regular work in student personnel training. I say that because it gives us something of an outline of the degree to which the institutions there are moving in in full force.

I should like you to know that the Ministry of Education is giving full support to the project, that from all sources there seems to be a feeling in Japan that something must be done of a very urgent nature in order that the universities there will truly represent the new Japan. That does not mean that we have missed all of the tough sledding which goes with such projects, but we can say that with the finest cooperation and the work of an excellent faculty (many of you know the members of the faculty that are there) from institutions in this country, it seems now that the Japanese universities are taking a special interest in the work of student personnel services.

Let me draw a few contrasts that may be of interest. If a Dean of Students is appointed in a Japanese university he is

someone who is on a rotating basis. I do not mean by that that the deans of students in our universities are not rotating. I see some of that also [laughter], but when they are appointed as a Dean of Students in Japan they are appointed to rotate. They are appointed to do this bad, hard, difficult work, and then get away and rest a while. It is assumed that they should have the opportunity of the luxury of the academic life after they have been in this kind of fire for a year or two. Of course, some only last a month or two, but very often they go on to their full one or two years and then the experience which they have gained moves off and a new man comes in for his share of torture, until he can bear it for his usual length of time and then he moves on.

Why is it that a president of the university has a difficult time in getting a Dean of Students in Japan? First, because they are beginning to find out that a Dean of Students is a very unpopular animal there. Next, they are discovering that a Dean of Students receives no additional remuneration for his work, nor does he receive any release time from his academic load. He is expected to do that for the good of the cause, and so without any more academic advancement, without added salary, he approaches his work as one who has been called on a short mission. In that kind of professional attitude, the Japanese universities were attempting to find out ways of promoting student personnel services.

I should say a word about the term "guidance." When we arrived in Japan we were called a guidance faculty, or it was to be a guidance institute. There was only one thing wrong with that, and that was that the term guidance in that country had accumulated a very negative meaning. It was so negative, as a result of thought controls that came during the war -- of course the guidance associations on each campus were used as the thought-control agencies -- that among the students any idea of guidance was just like a red flag being waved before them and they were ready to get rid of it.

We were not anxious to be put out of the way quite so soon, and so we thought we had better plan ways to describe the Institute accurately, so it was called the Institute for Personnel Services, in Japanese universities.

With some of those first understandings clarified, we had what seemed to be a golden opportunity. As I suggested, it seemed that our greatest limitation was ourselves. How could we wean ourselves from our own background and surrounding long enough to be of some use in a new situation? How could we forget that a certain kind of organization was better on our campus, while we tried to see if it could be useful to the Japanese? In this we felt that there was some gain, and there was a Japanese

faculty appointed to work with us, and group procedures were established whereby the participants themselves could largely formulate their own programs.

The university in Japan is a very cloistered place. It is cloistered in these ways: What corresponds to our boards of trustees, or our boards of regents, are made up of members of the faculty. In that way there is no special, outside interference. Another way in which they are cloistered is that the president is elected by the faculty. The universities do not feel very much responsibility to the public cause. They seem to have a very important role to play of their own as separate from the societal functions. With universities being somewhat separated they can take their own approach to their own problems, and some of these approaches are most unique.

We should keep in mind, it seems to me, that in contrast to our country, the national universities of Japan are rated 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and so on. There is not very much discussion about which is supposed to be the best. The University of Tokyo, for instance, is rated No. 1, the University of Kyoto is rated No. 2. Very frankly, the people of Kyoto University rate it No. 2, not No. 1. Here in America, I always rate Brigham Young University as No. 1; Shorty usually recognizes the University of Texas as No. 1; and so we go along kidding each other, little realizing the major weaknesses in all of our institutions. There are certain institutions also that would vie with the University of Texas for being America's No. 1. Japan has no such problem. There is Japan No. 1, Japan No. 2, Japan No. 3, and each university knows its place and does not attempt to get out of its place. It is a kind of interesting and easy mechanical way of rating things.

The university students who can be admitted to the University of Tokyo, of course, are admitted to the University of Tokyo. That is where they go to school. So we find there an institution which probably has had more influence on its government and on its nation than any one institution that I know of in the history of the world, for in Japan the University is rated very highly, and when one university is given such a spectacular position it has intense influence on the agencies around it.

So we have the dominant university system. We have also the problem of pay for professors. An ordinary professor gets around two thousand yen per month, or about \$55.00 per month. There is little complaint, as there is here among us who get \$60.00 a month. [Laughter] But those \$55-a-month professors are doing some excellent work. The general routine of education,

as you know, is centered in research and the lecture in Japan. One of the great tasks of student personnel service is to bring about some condition under which students may be heard. Now, whether we call that the democratic process, or the group process, or whatever it may be, one of the prominent university presidents in Japan just a day or two after I arrived said, "If the American Institute on Student Personnel Services, and if the American faculty can be of assistance to Japanese universities in bringing the students and the faculty together in a cooperative endeavor, in contrast to the competitive work of the present, then it will be one of the greatest contributions we can have to our higher education system." And it was that sort of thing into which the faculty went.

One of the first experiences I went into was to go into a meeting in which 500 of the students of Japan were just getting ready and being oriented to get on the ship to come to America as the GAARIOA group of that month. There has been very significant work done there.

I believe it would be of special importance to us to think of certain phases of student life in that fascinating country. When we think of student life we think of the life of a very small percentage of the students. In Japan the student is primarily interested in the subject matter in his classroom. Ninety per cent of the students are concerned primarily with going and listening to the lecture, making certain that they have carefully prepared notes, using their memories to the finest of their abilities, and at that, after four years of listening and note taking they are given their degrees. Failure is not nearly so common in the Japanese university as it is in our own here, and the student, once admitted, feels a very strong chance of being given his degree at the end of the expected time.

There is a small group of students in the Japanese university that is giving very special concern to the people of the entire country. [Remarks off the record]

One of the very useful things which seemed to have been accomplished was the Presidents' Conferences. I would like to describe these in some detail because in our sessions here over the years I have heard dozens of us -- I have participated in it along with you -- say, "If only my president could be here for just a half hour." We have always wanted our presidents to get in on some of the things that we have been studying. So when our Institute participants got together and said, "This is fine. We had no ideas that such things existed, but why can't we get some of it to our presidents?" well that was a signal for two kinds of activities. We had already started the one, however, before the complaints came in.

During the first months of its stay in Japan the American faculty has visited more than 80 of the universities and held conferences with the presidents and deans of faculties in each institution. These conferences lasted from 2 to 7 hours. We have been able to talk frankly across the table with the presidents and deans, and we have been talking about what might be done on this specific campus to improve faculty-student relations and to reorganize administratively so that some effective work can be done. The reasons why those visits were made I think would be very evident. It would have been a very bad blunder for us to have gone there attempting to present an American pattern to Japanese universities. It was most important that we let them know that we were there to study, and in one of the early Presidents' Conferences, one President later remarked to the others, "The fine thing about this is that this faculty has visited almost 100 of our institutions to study our needs." On that study basis we operated the Institutes.

Regarding the Presidents' Conferences, the people in Japan were somewhat of one opinion that it would be impossible to get the Presidents of all types of universities together to come to one place for a three-day conference. In effect, we said, "We know just how you feel. It is impossible in America also. If we asked the presidents of the universities in America to come to one place to discuss student personnel for three days, we may not get very far." But after a good deal of work and reasoning, we said, "What is there to lose? Let's try it." One of the most glorious surprises of our year has been the way in which the presidents of all types of institutions have responded to the invitation. They have not sent their Vice-Presidents; they have not sent their Deans or their Business Managers, but almost in all cases the President has been sure that he came himself. In addition to coming, he has brought, in many cases, the chief of his Business Office who is a very powerful figure in Japan, as he is becoming in America. [Laughter]

In these sessions the presidents do not sit and listen to the American faculty. There is just enough of the opening up with the Japanese and American faculty to get a discussion going. There are certain questions asked about the present procedures in Japanese universities. There are questions raised about the problems yet to be solved, and then the presidents divide into small groups and go around a table and under the assistance of a Japanese and an American faculty member they point out and come to focus on certain issues. Then at the close of the day they come back in general sessions. This pattern is not so new, except that it is a little bit new for presidents. They come back and in their panel discussions and round tables give patterns of what they are going to do when they get back to their campuses in reference to administrative reorganization. They tell the other

presidents in the group what they are going to do with reference to their dean of students. They tell the other presidents what they are going to do now that the dean of students, the regular participants from the faculty and they themselves have had an opportunity to discuss student personnel services in focus.

You know what effect that would have upon us here. It has about the same effect there. When one president says what he is going to do, it does not seem quite so epoch making if another president decides that he is going to do it, and before long we have a kind of testimony meeting, and the student personnel services begins to take on the essence of a religious approach. Then they begin to say to themselves, "Why haven't we been thinking of these things a little bit on our own before?"

In describing the Presidents' Conferences, it is easy for me to become over-enthusiastic because I have seen even when presidents in our own country decide that they will do things that there are a large group of academic people around them who will largely determine whether the president will do those things or not, and the president finds that his hands are not so free; and he finds that his Dean of Student's hands are not so free. But we feel that it is most significant that the presidents have been willing to come together and to say on their own what they plan to do now about student personnel services.

As time slips along, I think I will describe just one other phase of the Institutes, because I think it is a phase that you and I have been thinking about and have not had an opportunity to do too much with. That is the in-service training of the American faculty. In going to Japan I hardly recognized the possibilities that were before me for a year. I little realized how much there was yet to be learned, even though I had been in some of our conferences and knew that I was a long way from all-wise in it.

Let's say, for instance, it is my turn to open the day's work with a brief lecture, and then the Institute divides for the day to work on the problem and then come back for a late afternoon airing and setting of patterns, further patterns. But if it was my turn to give a short presentation, I do not have the luxury which I have on my own campus for among ourselves we have agreed that before I present a topic every member of the faculty will hear what I am going to say and how I am going to do it. Each member of that faculty will be asked how he would do it. He also is trained in a very closely related field to mine, whatever that might be. Then when it is my turn I go there knowing that I am not in the luxury of a person who can just do as he thinks his own special training will justify. When it is the turn of another

member of the faculty, it is also my turn to say to him, "Now I am ignorant about your field perhaps, but here is the way it looks to me-it ought to be done." Then we debate the point. Needless to say, all of us have had to change our minds many times about the things which we knew had been set forever. We have had to pull up our stakes and say, "Does this thing apply to the Japanese, or are we merely unwinding some of our own favorite points?" Then when we finish we have another bull session and it is a dandy. It sometimes takes us four or five hours in the evening. We get to bed eleven or twelve o'clock after having been pretty well gone over. We have had to defend the things we did that day. It is done all in good spirit and it does not constitute a perfect educational program, but the one thing it does is to take us off our high horses long enough to say to ourselves, "Is this thing any good? Does it have any practical application to something that counts?"

So I am suggesting today that perhaps if our own students in American universities had an opportunity to vote they may want to say, "We wish that our own professors here were a little more responsible to one another for what they say in classes." They would also like to say, "I hope they will smooth each other off a little bit before they are turned loose on us."

Those are the things which we have had an opportunity to do, which we could not do in the regular conventional kinds of programs. These are the things which may be of some assistance to the Japanese universities. One thing which we seem to have been held to, even though it does not sound like it from this address, is a kind of refreshing humility, for the Japanese people are not the kind of braggarts that we in America have developed into over many decades. The Japanese people are quick to recognize their limitation and it is a refreshing experience to listen to them say, "Now we are not any good in this sort of thing. The reason we have not been able to do anything is for this, and this and this reason." We say, "Why don't you do anything? They usually say, "Well, we are just not smart enough."

Kind of a foreign country, isn't it? We all have some of those kinds of feelings in us, but we sometimes run over the wall. We brag about our own institutions. We sing our loyalty choruses. We keep ourselves pretty well stimulated to cover up the weaknesses that are all around us, but somehow we do not see that quite as commonly there as I have found it in our own country here.

In presenting to you some of the general characteristics, I must not overlook the problem of the professional organizations. Several organizations have been formed and by the end of the year professional organizations for student personnel

services will have been formed, we think, in all of the areas of Japan. It will not take a great unifying program there to bring those organizations together. The main thing it will take is just a little more patient work. The Japanese will move through into this program, it seems, in a more hurried fashion than we here in our country. As they meet a critical problem that they have to adjust to in a year or two, I have thought of the great advancements which we have made in our own way. We do not move as one body, one nation. We do not jump just one small step at a time, and all jump at the same time. There is a little greater tendency for them to move together. Here there seems to be a kind of strength that each institution has had to stand on its own. We have had some pretty heavy battles in student personnel in the States. We have had to realize (and sometimes we have regarded it as a great weakness) that we could not all just move together. But as we see things in another framework it becomes one of the most strengthening things about our entire process, the fact that we do move in different ways and in different institutions.

There is another advantage which we have had over the many years, and which puts us in a sense in a kind of leadership. That has been the advantage of having a twenty-five year period in which to get ready for the present dynamic days.

Feature in contrast the nation of Japan, meeting even more serious, sudden difficulties, without twenty-five years experience in handling students in this fashion and having to make their adjustment all at once. There you have something of the critical situation which exists in Japan. It seems to me that our offer for help has been a little late, but certainly they are appreciative of the fine possibilities that lie ahead for them in this field.

So we have there a friendly nation, a nation interested in what we are doing, a nation glad for our help, a nation not embittered by defeat. I suppose I ought to say this off the record, but it seems to me that the Japanese have been less confused by defeat than we have been by victory. They are a kind of people who can stand, and expect, the unexpected, and when it comes along they do not seem to be taken off their feet. They do not seem to sense everything as a total emergency.

It will be rather gratifying for me to be able to return to Tokyo and say that I have touched again the friendly spirit of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, and the American College Personnel Association, and other professional Associations of this country. It would be a fine thing if I could also take those young organizations greetings from such groups as this, greetings of encouragement and hope that we may

develop inter-relations that will be mutually beneficial, for in that rich culture of Japan we do not find a nation that needs to merely adopt what we have, but on an inter-change it seems to me that we have much to gain from them.

So as I return I will return to a people who have a feeling that they must do something realistic in order to bring their students and their faculties to a more intelligent expression in higher education, and I return to a people who have had something of the misfortune of not being able to develop this service as methodically and as gradually as you and I have had the pleasure of doing.

It is a great pleasure to be with you again, even for a day, and I want you to know that I am the only one perhaps in this body of people today that has been singularly benefitted by this address. Thank you. [Prolonged applause]

CHAIRMAN GOODNIGHT: Thank you, Dean Lloyd. The applause shows what pleasure the audience has taken in listening to your description of the work in Japan.

Would you like to take any action in response to Dean Lloyd's suggestion at the close of his remarks here that we send some sort of a greeting to the struggling personnel associations in Japan?

DEAN HAACK: I so move.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

CHAIRMAN GOODNIGHT: It has been moved and seconded that we send a greeting to the Associations in Japan. Would it perhaps be more in order if we appointed a committee to draft such a resolution, or is just a greeting all that is necessary, Dean Lloyd? What would you say?

DEAN STROZIER: Let Wes write what he thinks we ought to say.

MR. BLAESER: The Committee on Resolutions is doing some thinking on that right now.

CHAIRMAN GOODNIGHT: Very good. Then we will just let it ride with passing the motion which has been made and seconded. All who are in favor signify by saying "aye." Contrary, "no." It is so ordered.

Do you wish to discuss these papers, or to ask any questions? We have a few minutes in which to entertain questions.

SECRETARY TURNER: I would like to ask this question, directed to Wes. Could you tell us in a very few minutes which phases of student personnel work seem to be most acceptable and which ones are being discarded?

DEAN LLOYD: The most acceptable ones seem to be the faculty advising program. They are there without professionals at work and they feel if they start with faculty advising that will be their first project to accomplish.

They are getting greatly interested in the counseling system, but without counselors and without experts in tests and measurements they are having to slow down considerably in that field.

We are having some problem with the field of vocational education, which we would expect to be one of their first, because the social situation is so different. Here we think a person has a right to choose a vocation. In Japan they are not quite so sure yet that these shall be chosen as a free choice. That constitutes a problem there.

I think, then, the faculty advising, the housing program -- they are very anxious to work on student housing -- their student loans and scholarships is a very significant phase, and what they have called "student arbeit," after the German pattern, in which they are trying to do some major revising.

SECRETARY TURNER: What about health services?

DEAN LLOYD: The health services are recognized as important, but they are limited to those institutions that have hospitals attached. They are attempting to get some work done on student health, and the thing that instituted that is the commonness of tuberculosis among the students. They have had to take some rather drastic action in that regard.

CHAIRMAN GOODNIGHT: Perhaps a thirty minute interlude would be more to your liking just now than the continuation of the question session. If there is nothing further we will be adjourned until three o'clock.

... The Luncheon Session recessed at two-thirty o'clock ...

FRIDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

April 4, 1952

The Conference reconvened at three-ten o'clock, President Knapp presiding.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Gentlemen, it is my thought that, without blocking anything that you wish to bring to this floor this afternoon, we expedite our business as rapidly as possible in the hopes of an early adjournment so that all of us can enjoy some of this sunshine before dinner. [Applause]

... Announcements ...

SECRETARY TURNER: Tomorrow morning's session at nine o'clock is our only chance to do a thing that there has been a good deal of complaint about. A good many of our members were concerned about the fact that there was no opportunity to talk about their current problems. When we originally planned the program we planned two such conference sessions for the discussion of current problems that anyone wanted to talk about. We had to throw one of them out completely. The purpose of tomorrow morning's session is to give you a chance to ask "How do you solve this problem that I have?" or "How can I help you solve your problem?" The two hours in the morning are cut back from the five we had originally hoped to have, but we couldn't get them in. We think we have worked you hard enough as it is.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: I think I can assure you that the final and general session tomorrow at eleven will be a very brief one, but it is rather important as a concluding session, and I hope we might have a good attendance.

Dean Gardner, as chairman of the Committee on Nominations and Place, is now recognized.

DEAN GARDNER (Committee on Nominations and Place): Mr. President, your Committee would first like to submit a motion:

It is recommended that the Committee on Nominations and Place be enlarged by the election of three members at large to serve for a period of one year, the method of election to be determined by the Executive Committee and the new members to begin their service with the 1953 Conference.

I so move, Mr. President.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: This means that in addition to our customary committee consisting of past presidents in attendance at the meeting, beginning next year, there will be three members of the Association who will have been elected by that time in a manner to be decided upon by your new Executive Committee, who will serve with our customary committee. Is there any discussion?

... The question was called for ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: All those in favor signify by the usual sign. Opposed. The motion is adopted.

DEAN GARDNER: Your Committee would like to recommend that the 1953 Conference be held at Michigan State College, with Dean Tom King as host. I so move.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Is there any discussion?

DEAN MATTHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I think it appropriate -- and perhaps Don intends to do so -- when a motion like this is made, that there be some explanation made to those members present as to the procedure or the pattern that is followed in this organization in selecting a meeting place. I say this because I formerly was a member of a group about this size and in that group the membership itself had considerable say about where the meeting was held. As a new member, I am not too familiar with the pattern used in this organization. I think for all new members it would be most valuable to have some explanation. I would also like to know what other opportunities we have had, what invitations we have had. I presume they have been considered and I think the membership is entitled to know some of the facts about the proposed site for the next meeting.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: The suggestion is appropriate.

DEAN GARDNER: Mr. Chairman, your Committee has normally followed the procedure of meeting twice in the middle west, since the largest number of our membership comes from the states through Illinois, Indiana, Iowa and Pennsylvania, I believe, and then once in the east and in the west, to alternate. The "west" and the "east" have been in the south frequently. We have tried to meet on college campuses; sometimes, however, due to the vicissitudes of war and so forth, we have met in urban hotels. Your Committee has always been eager to receive invitations.

This year we received really three, although the third one from Miami was very late, to attend college campuses, the

other was from the Case-Western Reserve combination to meet in Cleveland, to meet, however, in a hotel. Since Tom King offered the services of this large Union (new, I believe) and the fact that general expression has been the desire to meet upon a college campus, your Committee so decided. Does that clarify it at all?

DEAN MATTHEWS: I assume you are speaking to the membership and not to me in particular.

DEAN GARDNER: You were the one who asked the question. Maybe somebody else has another one. This has been our policy for twenty-five years. It is okay with me if we change it.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Don, isn't there recently an additional policy that has influenced the thinking of the Committee and the group? While negatively reacting to invitations for affiliation with other organizations in this field, we have tried to demonstrate in point of fact our statement of a desire to cooperate by having our meeting both date-wise and place-wise in such a way that those of our members -- and there are many -- who belong to additional organizations might attend both meetings on the same trip, and that has influenced our thinking, I think in the last three or four years.

I would like to add also, for the benefit of the new members particularly that I recall several occasions on which the recommendation of the Committee on Place has been challenged from the floor, and this committee is not a sacrosanct committee. It is always capable of being challenged from the floor.

DEAN GARDNER: Correct.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Is there further discussion?

DEAN FOSTER E. ALTER (University of Miami): I would like to ask what the following year's geographic location would be?

DEAN GARDNER: The following year it would be in the east, to the south preferably, and then back to the middle west, and then back to the west or the southwest. Somebody was asking at lunch, and I was surprised to discover that about a fifth of our meetings had been held west of the Mississippi River, so of course we have had difficulty with our west coast folks who have to spend so much to come to what appear to be eastern meetings. I think there have been seven or eight meetings west of the Mississippi River.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Is there further discussion? If not,

all those in favor of the motion please so signify. Opposed.
The motion is carried.

DEAN TOM KING (Michigan State College): Thanks to all of you. We have a new, what we call an education building. It is a 192 room hotel right on the campus. We hope you will like it. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: We know we are going to like it.

DEAN GARDNER: For your slate of officers, for Secretary, we would like to recommend Fred again. I would like to offer a word of explanation. Fred has served us for fifteen years. If you will pardon the personal reference, I believe I am the only man alive now who ever served as Secretary before. It is a terribly dirty job. I don't know if you men realize the amount of time that it takes, and the amount of personal energy and expenditure that goes into it. We have asked Fred if he would serve again and he has said that if you so desire, he will. This is, I believe, the longest tenure of anybody, any place, including Franklin Delano Roosevelt. [Laughter]

I would like to recommend for Secretary, Dean F. H. Turner of the University of Illinois, for our constitutional term of three years.

... Cries of "Second." The audience arose and there was prolonged applause ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: The Chair sees no need of putting this motion to a vote. [Laughter] As a President of this organization, may I simply say that out of the depths of my heart I congratulate your new President, whomever he may be, because of this election of Fred Turner.

DEAN GARDNER: For Vice-Presidents, your Committee recommends Director Donald M. DuShane of the University of Oregon; and Dean Everett Hunt of Swarthmore College. I so move.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Are there further nominations, which I think are definitely in order. Are you ready for the question?

... The question was called for ...

SECRETARY TURNER: I think it might be pointed out that we are electing as Vice-Presidents a Dean of Students and a Dean of Men.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Fred has appropriately suggested that I point out to you that the nominations include a Dean of Students and a Dean of Men. Are you ready for the question? All in favor signify by the usual sign. Opposed. The motion is carried.

DEAN GARDNER: For President of this illustrious Association, Mr. President, to succeed your august self, your Committee recommends Dean Vic Spathelf of Wayne University. I so move.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Are there further nominations?

... The question was called for ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: All those in favor signify by the usual sign. Opposed. The motion is carried.

As soon as we have taken care of the business of the Committee on Resolutions, we will have the pleasure of being greeted by our newly elected officers very briefly from this rostrum. I will call now for the Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions to present his report.

DEAN ARDEN O. FRENCH (Louisiana State University; Chairman, Committee on Resolutions): Mr. Chairman, I wish to express appreciation for the splendid cooperation of every member of my Committee in the formulation of this report. I have been fortunate in having a 100 per cent attendance and these resolutions are a conglomeration of the words of these six men at breakfast this morning. In order that they might share in the satisfaction of your unanimous approval of the resolutions, and come to my aid in the event you decide to reject any of them, I would like to present them to you and have them stand. [The members of the Committee were presented] Resolution No. 1:

"BE IT RESOLVED: That the Conference express its appreciation:

"A. To President Wm. H. Gill, Dean Juan Reid and his Associates and Dean Adams for their hospitality and personal attention to the details of the Conference, all of which has contributed to a successful convention and enjoyable time on the parts of the delegates. The spirit of this first National Assembly of the newly created National Association of Student Personnel Administrators has been largely due to their thoughtful approach to the many problems involved. In behalf of the wives, appreciation is also expressed to Mrs. Juan Reid and members of her Committee for their program and entertainment.

"B. To the Management of the Broadmoor Hotel and all of its employees, we express our deepest appreciation. Their services and interest in the material welfare of the convention and delegates deserve public commendation."

Mr. President, I move the adoption of this resolution.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: All those in favor signify by the usual sign. Opposed. The motion is adopted.

DEAN FRENCH: Resolution No. 2:

"BE IT RESOLVED: That the delegates to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators express their appreciation to President Blair Knapp and members of the Executive Committee for their leadership, guidance and untiring efforts in the direction of this Association during the past year."

Since the appreciation is to the President, I will take the Chair and entertain a second to my motion that the Resolution be adopted.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

DEAN FRENCH: All in favor say "aye." It is carried.

Resolution No. 3:

"Whereas, this Association has been fortunate in having as its secretary a man who embodies all of the tradition of NADAM and all of the hopes and aspirations of NASPA.

"Whereas, he has continued to give leadership to the development of the new Association with untiring and sacrificial time. Be it therefore

"RESOLVED: That NASPA express its deep felt gratitude to our Secretary, Fred Turner, and his staff, especially Miss Hazel Yates."

Mr. President, I move the adoption of this resolution.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: I will entertain a second.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: All those in favor signify by the usual sign. Opposed. The motion is adopted.

DEAN FRENCH: Resolution No. 4:

"Whereas, it has been reported during the year that death has taken away from our Association three of our members, namely:

Dean Christian Gauss, Emeritus, Princeton University,
Dean Arthur Ray Warnock, Emeritus, Pennsylvania State
College, and
Dean Leslie I. Reed, Emeritus, Iowa State Teachers
College; be it

"RESOLVED: That this convention stand in a one minute reverence of their memory and silently recall their long and eternal influence upon the developments of personal services to higher education."

Mr. President, I move the direction of this Memorial service.

PRESIDENT LLOYD: I suggest we rise by way of both second and adoption.

... The audience arose and stood in silent tribute to the memory of Deans Gauss, Warnock and Reed ...

DEAN FRENCH: Resolution No. 5:

"Whereas the program of this Conference has been greatly assisted by a number of key addresses, all of which have contributed to the thinking of all of the delegates, be it therefore

"RESOLVED: That the Secretary be directed to write a letter of appreciation from the Conference to: Dr. Glenn A. Olds, Chaplain, University of Denver; Dr. Bryant Wedge, University Health Service, University of Chicago; Dr. Dana Farnsworth, Director, Health Service, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. Ben Cherrington, Director, Denver and Rocky Mountain Regional Office, Institute of International Education; Dr. Alva C. Jacobs, Chancellor, University of Denver; and President Paul M. Pitman, College of Idaho."

I move the adoption of the Resolution.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: All those in favor signify by the usual sign. Opposed. The motion is adopted.

DEAN FRENCH: Resolution No. 6:

"Whereas, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators has undertaken responsibilities in new areas of interest, new policies, and a new vision of its place in higher education as evidenced by the work of the five Commissions, be it therefore

"RESOLVED: That we extend our appreciation to these Commissions for the work they have done and that we endorse this organizational trend, continue these five Commissions and encourage the further use of these techniques in other areas related to the interests of this Association."

I move the adoption of the resolution.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: By way of explanation, our authorization of these Commissions last year was not on a one year basis, so their discontinuance would have to be based upon your vote. This motion is simply an authorization for their approval next year. Is there any discussion? All those in favor signify by the usual sign. Opposed. The motion is adopted.

DEAN FRENCH: Resolution No. 7:

"Whereas, there has been widespread concern over such matters as academic honesty, integrity in athletics, and promotional programs in Institutions of Higher Learning; be it

"RESOLVED: That this Association endorse and encourage programs of universities and colleges and associations related to higher education in their continuing efforts to strengthen honesty and integrity in all activities associated with education."

I move the adoption of this resolution.

... The motion was duly seconded, voted upon and carried ...

DEAN FRENCH: Resolution No. 8:

"Whereas, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators owes its existence, a large share of its leadership, traditions, loyalties and friendships covering a third of a century to NADAM, be it

"RESOLVED: That the officers and executive committee be instructed hereafter to give substantial weight to the

responsibilities and problems relating particularly to Men's Affairs and the administrators entrusted with them in the planning of future Conferences; and that these considerations be kept in mind in providing for the appointment of Commissions and the carrying on of the work of NASPA between Conferences."

I move the adoption of this resolution.

... The motion was duly seconded, voted upon and carried ...

DEAN FRENCH: By way of explanation for the final resolution, the Committee had it called to their attention that this Conference, NASPA, has been particularly honored in the selection of Wesley Lloyd to carry the message of this type of work in higher education to Japan. It therefore wanted to pass a resolution which would make it possible for us to give to Wesley Lloyd some message of encouragement to carry back with him. We did not have time, however, to formulate a complete and detailed statement, so we have a very simple resolution for your consideration. Resolution No. 9:

"BE IT RESOLVED: That this Convention authorize the President of NASPA to construct a letter of greetings and best wishes to 'The Professional Personnel Associations of Japan' and that this letter be presented to Wesley P. Lloyd, Past President of this Association, for 'flying' transmission to Japan."

I move the adoption of this resolution.

... The motion was duly seconded, voted upon and carried ...

DEAN FRENCH: Mr. President, if you have no more trouble than I did, your next year will be a success.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: There is just one question I would like to ask, wholly for purposes of clarification, so we are not confused. The resolution with respect to the continuance of the Commissions, I assume, is with the understanding that present personnel may be retained or under certain circumstances new personnel may be added, wholly at the discretion of the new President and the Executive Committee?

DEAN FRENCH: That was the understanding.

PRESIDENT LLOYD: Are there any questions on that point from the floor? There will be some shifting of personnel, and some maintained, depending very largely on the wishes of existing

personnel, I am sure, but I think that ought to be understood.

Are there resolutions from the floor, either in final form, or suggested resolutions that might be drafted for submission tomorrow? Do you think something has been left out? The Chair hears none.

DEAN STONE: Mr. President, I have no resolutions to offer, but I do have an introduction which I would like to make, if I may. I would like to introduce Mr. J. C. Lang, Chief Educational Officer of the Bureau of Navy Personnel, is an official guest of this Conference who just arrived, being detained also by airplane engine trouble. Dr. Lang. [Applause as he arose]

PRESIDENT KNAPP: We are very sorry you could not be with us sooner, Sir.

There isn't any particular order in the presentation of our officers for next year, but just arbitrarily in the same order in which Don presented them, I think we would all like to hear a word from Fred Turner. [Applause]

SECRETARY TURNER: President Blair and Members of the Association: I think this story perhaps may be applicable. [Remarks off the record] You had your opportunity to fire me, and you didn't do it, so I'll be right on the job for the next three years. [Laughter and applause]

PRESIDENT KNAPP: It is my pleasure to present Don DuShane, your new Vice-President. [Applause]

VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT DONALD M. DuSHANE: I should be less than candid if I did not indicate to you my deep appreciation and also my firm resolve to serve as well as I can in this next year. At the same time I reaffirm my loyalty to NADAM as well as to NASPA. [Applause]

PRESIDENT KNAPP: It is a very real pleasure for me to anticipate turning the gavel over tomorrow morning to Vic Spathelf. [Applause]

PRESIDENT-ELECT SPATHELF: President Blair and Members of the Association: I will have to confess to you that I do not have the benefit of a prior consultation that evidently Fred Turner had, in the report of this committee; therefore, I will have to confess a considerable element of surprise as I was sitting back there rather comfortably with Rudolph Godolphin, speculating on other things. I also would be remiss if I did not express to you my real appreciation for the honor and confidence which is implicit in your action.

I believe very thoroughly in this organization. I believe in the heritage and tradition which surrounds this organization and which has been made possible by the devoted service of sincere and devoted people of the past which has made possible the expanded horizons of this Association. I believe in our ability to work together and I believe in our fundamental professional integrity which surrounds this fellowship.

I believe that we have in our midst the abilities and wisdom which we may call upon to solve all of the problems and issues which we can bring before us. I believe in the capacity which is ours to assume a perspective which will indicate our organizational destiny as well as bring service to ourselves and to others in the interests of better serving students.

I believe also that you value, as I do, the essential characteristics of teamwork which has always characterized this Association, and that you would have me merely be an instrument for continuing that teamwork, and this I will try my best to do. Thank you very much. [Applause]

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Is there further business to come before this meeting this afternoon?

DEAN GARDNER: I move we adjourn.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: I just want to say one word before you can do that. Vic talked about the fact that he was not apprised of what was going to happen. I think for the benefit of the new members, I have to say that that is one of the cute tricks the Past Presidents cook up. They want it to be more of a surprise to the one who has been tapped than to the membership itself. For fear that some of you may not be here tomorrow as I hand the gavel to Vic, let me say simply that I have enjoyed this.

Last night somebody who has not had as many years experience in this organization as some of the rest of us said, "Were you unhappy at last night's session?" I said, "Indeed no. I don't know how it is going to come out in a vote, and it does not matter because any way it is settled, it will be settled with good spirit and appreciation on all sides, because that is the tradition of this organization."

Beginning next year, my institution will be represented by its Dean of Men, but I shall exercise the prerogative of being a past president by coming around just as often as I can make it. It has been grand fun. Thank you very much. I really enjoyed it. [Applause]

Bill Dentzer is here. Bill, would you like to say a few words? Bill Dentzer has probably one of the most responsible positions affecting the kids that we are concerned with. This organization, without taking official positions on it particularly in its individual membership, has been extremely sympathetic to the objectives and ideals of the National Students Association. I think we would enjoy a few words from Bill at this time.

MR. WM. T. DENTZER (Pres., U. S. National Student Association; University of Colorado): I thank you very much for allowing me to be here and for the opportunity of saying something to the group. I think there are three or four things that have been on my mind as I have been here that I would like you to know. I say it very humbly.

A lot of misconceptions are abroad about NSA, and you can help a great deal in clearing them up, and we can help you a great deal I think in working together to accomplish what you are doing as a Dean of Men. You are surely not doing it for money, because you don't get any money for doing it. You are doing it for something else, and I think an organization like the NSA can help in this. I think it can, and I hope it will, but you have in a large measure the final say as to whether it will or will not. Let me say about three things. Let me make my remarks first of all internationally. Let me say this: The National Students Association this year has a budget of approximately \$150,000.00 for international activities. That is a good bit of money. We are getting it from people, frankly, who do not like communism and want to do something to fight it.

I have been lucky enough to have been in Europe and to have been in South America for three weeks, at international student meetings where the NSA is taking the lead in drawing together non-communist groups across this world to fight an organization called the International Union of Students (IUS), which is a communist-dominated organization and which is fundamentally the youth arm of the Comintern foreign policy. It is the organization that sponsored the Berlin Peace Festival. Little by little we are accomplishing this work, you see.

Having spent some time in South America, where we had to strike out Marxian terms from resolutions, and were having telephone wires tapped by communists, and had to spend day after day and night after night up so they could not beat us, it is disheartening to come back to the United States and have people talk about the pink fringe of the National Student Association. Let me tell you now, there is no pink fringe of the National Student Association as far as I know. I come from a small United Presbyterian College in Ohio that does not specialize in educating communists. If you look at the National Students Association's

Advisory Council, you will see men like Blair Knapp, who is not a communist, and Harold Stassen who even Jessop says is not a communist, and other people like that. From the programs of NSA you can see, I think, that we are doing a most significant work internationally as a student organization to fight this thing that is threatening us abroad.

We talked at lunch today about exchange. Let me tell you this briefly. The National Students Association presented this kind of an argument to the State Department: That for a long time we have been getting foreign students here to study chemistry and engineering. They have studied chemistry and engineering for four or six years and have gone back to their own countries, not knowing anything about the way we live, not having contacts with students in the United States or the faculty in the United States. They have gone back to talk to a very limited audience. We tried to sell the Department of State this program: The program of bringing student leaders now in Germany to the United States for one year or less to work with student governments and personnel administrators to study not chemistry or engineering, but the American way of life, if you take that in its right connotation, and to go back one year later in a position where they are still student leaders and can do some good for the things we are fighting for.

This was an amazing thing to present to the Department of State. It was rather new, but we think, some of us, that our program of educational exchange has fallen down on the local level. I wish Mr. Cherrington was here. Perhaps he is. I hope you will in all sincerity accept my humbleness in saying this, but I think the whole exchange program has fallen down on the local level. Foreign student advisors and students who do care about international exchange have not been given the opportunity to do the most significant work that can be done, and that is on the local level. We are selling that to the Department now, and they have agreed to try it on a limited basis.

I talked to Theron Johnson, who is at the University of Minnesota, about this recently. The University of Minnesota is one of the schools getting this program. He was in Germany on the other end of the exchange program, and he said that for three years he had been trying to sell the Department this concept. He congratulated us on doing it. I think we are doing a great deal in the field of international relations. We are bringing the presidents of all the South American Student Unions to the National Student Congress, to show them how we live in the democratic way we talk about. It is going to do a great deal for international understanding.

I was surprised to find the number of people in this world who still believe that we started the war in Korea. We are doing a great deal, I believe, to change their views and bring them the truth.

NSA has a pink fringe, some people say, yet if you will follow the communist party line you will find that the people saying this are really helping the communists because the communists are saying that NSA is a bunch of fascists and imperialist aggressors, and the schools that are not in, you see, are representatives or examples of the fact that American students really do support the Chinese volunteers, for example, who are throwing back the American imperialist aggressors. I can twist that around by saying that every school that is not in the Association must be following the communist line -- but that is not fair, because I do not believe in guilt by association.

I want you to know how we are trying to bring this thing down to the local level. That is why I believe there should be a National Student Association internationally. Let me cite one example, nationally, because I think it affects you too. At the National Student Association Congress we took a stand to work for de-commercializing and de-emphasizing inter-collegiate sports because we believe the tail is wagging the dog. I played football in high school and college. I love athletics, but I think they are a little too high in some of our realms of education. I do not think the most important thing a person can get out of college or a university is football training. Consequently, you see we are speaking across the nation on this thing. Perhaps the presidents, and I know you people as Deans, can say this that if you could have a buffer to stand between you and the alumni, some sort of anonymous buffer, you could say, "Good heavens, the students favor this thing. What can I do about it?" I think it will help in de-commercializing and de-emphasizing collegiate athletics.

Finally, I think the NSA can be a real help to you. I am the president of the National Federation of Student Governments and I tell them as I tell you frankly that I do not think in practice student governments deserve to exist -- that is, most of them. That is a strange statement coming from me. I think in principle they do. I think some do deserve to exist, but I have seen situations where Deans who have given their lives to education have labored for four or five years to build up some sort of spirit of friendship in a community, and have seen it destroyed because two or three college presidents of the student body have been elected who have destroyed all of their four or five or fifteen years' work. I think when that happens in a sense it is too bad we have student government.

In the NSA I think you have an organization which is preaching that we have to have an educational community; that you can't have students here, and faculty here, and administrators here; that the people who really do care about education (and they include some students on your campuses) should work together with the people who do care on the administrative levels to do something about it. You and I know that some faculty look at your jobs and say and think that your job as Dean is to plan recreational activities, and plan some hop-sotch for students. You and I know this is a great fallacy. Some faculty people think that students can go through fifteen hours of classroom work and come out with no extra-curricular training during their education, who can practice democracy. I think this is a fallacy. You realize that most of the students spend most of their time in extra-curricular and outside of the classroom activity. In the same sense you realize that most of the students spend most of their time with other students.

We must get students to realize that they have to live in an educational community, that they should talk to the Dean when something comes up, and they will find, as I have found, amazingly -- to destroy another fallacy that "the administration is always wrong" -- that the administration was usually right. There were enough of us who believed that, to take it back to our students and fight it out on that level. We were a big help, not because we were slaves of the administration, but because we believed that these people were the few people in our educational community who really saw why we had a college, and because we believed what they believed I think we helped transmit to some students on our campus a belief that we have to live in an educational community that preaches only one kind of division: the people who believe in an educational community (an effective one), against the people who do not believe in it. I am very sorry to say that most of the people who do not believe it, I am afraid, are students. So I think we have a big job to do.

NSA has preached the philosophy of the educational community on a national level. I do not think it has lived it on a local level, because many NSA's and student governments have fallen down there tremendously. I do not think we have practiced our philosophy on the national level either, and that is why we asked Vic Spathelf for some sort of liaison group from NSA and NASPA to work with us. That is why we are asking the Deans of Students across this nation to come as fraternity observers to the National Student Congress at the University of Indiana and to not sit there as just guests but to participate in commission workshop activities on student government problems.

Student governments have been falling down on the job tremendously. They have a big job to do, and I think we can help working with you to really make them worthwhile and to make students' extra-curricular activities worthwhile too.

I think NSA is growing up. We are five years old. We are not as old as your organization, but we are coming along. We would appreciate your help on the campus, not to get us established, but to help us in terms of advice, to help our student governments to really realize what their role is exactly, to stop just electing May Queens and having May Dances, and to do something that affects all students and the college where it should affect them, down deep, culturally, spiritually, intellectually and every other way. That is what we are trying to do. We need a lot of help, and we would like to work with you very much in the process.

We are looking forward to some great work out of our liaison committees. I am looking forward to having as many of you people as possible come to the National Student Congress. We are looking forward to working with you as partners in the educational community, as we really are, and really as we have not been working in the past I'm afraid.

Thanks for allowing me to be here. I would like to speak to all of you later, if you have time. Thanks again, and I hope really very much that we can work together. I know we have to if we really want to see what you people are giving your lives to turn out for the best. Thank you very much. [Applause]

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Thank you, Bill, for an excellent summary statement on NSA.

Is there further business? If not, the meeting stands adjourned.

... The Conference recessed at four o'clock ...

ANNUAL BANQUET SESSION

Friday Evening - April 4, 1952

The Annual Banquet Session convened at seven-forty o'clock, President Knapp presiding.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: The invocation will now be given by Father Rock, the representative of Georgetown University.

REV. JOSEPH A. ROCK, S. J. (Director of Student Personnel, Georgetown University): Bless, Eternal Father, these gifts which we are about to receive from Thy bountiful hands, finite creatures of Thy love which, quickening our understanding and appreciation, lead us to Thee, the Infinite Source of all goodness. Bless us in our sociability and discussions. Impart, moreover, Thy benediction, peace and truth to our academic halls and faculties, to the students who are the objects of our predilection and direction, to our communities and to our country.

This we ask in the name of Jesus Christ, Thy Son and our Lord who lives and reignest with Thee in the unity of the Holy Spirit, God, forever and ever. Amen.

... Dinner was then served ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: I am a three-time frustrated person tonight. The first time was that I asked to be billed as a retiring President. Some events in national affairs in the last two weeks asked me to be changed to presiding officer. [Laughter] I am frustrated again because, very seriously, a president has to make more speeches than he likes to make; but he likes to make them to the right kind of audiences, and I have never seen an audience to whom I would rather make a speech than this one. [Laughter and applause] My third frustration is that the speaker of the evening is one of the best friends I have in this world, and I can conceive of no honor I would rather have than introducing him, and I have given up that privilege.

For the last year and a half, in terms of my public speaking, I have been living on three jokes. I got the three jokes from our Toastmaster of the evening some two years ago. [Laughter] I forego the privilege and the pleasure of introducing the speaker of the evening on the distinct guarantee that I am to have four new ones tonight. [Laughter] Being a presiding officer it is my rare privilege to do just one thing, and I suppose it is epitomized perhaps best by one of his older stories which I don't think he is going to tell again, so I will. It is about the duffer golfer, who took a terrific swipe at the ball

and missed. He took up a bit of the turf, and the turf turned out to be an ant hill, and about ten thousand dead ants go down the fairway. Determined, he takes another grip on the club, swinging with a little more vigor. Ten thousand more ants go down the fairway. By this time, over on the side are two live ants, Minnie and Henry. Minnie turns to Henry and says, "Henry, if we are going to save our necks, we'd better get on the ball." [Laughter]

That is a Bill Tate story; and it is my distinguished pleasure to give you the Toastmaster of the evening, Bill Tate. [Applause]

TOASTMASTER WILLIAM TATE (University of Georgia): Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I thought he was going to make some statement about one of my Yankee friends who was playing golf, which I referred to as Confederate golf because he went out in 61 and came back in 65. [Laughter]

I am enjoying being out west. You know where I was born and raised, in Calhoun, Georgia, named of course for John C. Calhoun in appreciation for his writings on the rights of secession [laughter] in Gordon County in Georgia, named of course for John B. Gordon in appreciation for his being a Confederate General [laughter], where I live, anything west of Memphis, Tennessee is considered "the west." [Laughter] And I have come out here and been looking for the Pacific ocean across the next hill, for the last day or two. [Laughter] I was born, "bred" and buttered in the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains. Consequently I don't quite understand these hills that have no trees on them, because our beautiful Blue Ridge mountains, whose mesas to me are far more beautiful than Eden can be, have trees on them. There might be certain analogies drawn between women and mountains, if you yell at the side of a mountain it always echos back and gets the last word -- as a woman does. [Laughter] Mountains and women are usually broader at the base than they are at the top. [Laughter] Also, I like my women and my mountains with trees and hair on their heads. [Laughter] While I'm living I don't want to be married to a baldheaded woman, and when I'm dead I don't want to be buried among baldheaded mountains. [Laughter]

... Toastmaster Tate entertained the audience with many interesting stories and anecdotes ...

TOASTMASTER TATE: I want to introduce Mr. Victor F. Spathelf of Wayne University, the new President, who wishes to make an announcement. [Applause]

PRESIDENT-ELECT SPATHELF: I assure you that following

Bill is a very difficult task, and would be even more difficult had I not a pleasant duty to perform, and that is to introduce to you the new members of the Executive Committee.

Those of you who are new to our organization do not know perhaps that our Executive Committee is made up of our elected officers, our immediate past president and five members appointed from the membership. I should like to present them to you for your recognition: Dean Arden O. French, Louisiana State University; Dean Bernard L. Hyink of the University of Southern California; Dean Arno J. Haack of Washington University; Dean William S. Guthrie of Ohio State University; Dean Juan Reid of Colorado College. This is your new Executive Board. [Applause]

For the benefit of those who are statistically minded, this represents two Deans of Students, two Deans of Men, and a Junior Dean. They may enjoy, as I am enjoying, the rest of the evening, but my main purpose (besides presenting them to you) was to notify them that they go to work tomorrow immediately after the business session in the morning. Thank you very much. [Applause]

TOASTMASTER TATE: One of the Deans of Men today asked me, "Are you a Dean of Men? Are you going to withdraw from this organization now under the new program?" I said, "Hell no, the last time we seceded we got hell shot out of us." [Laughter]

... Applause as The Reverend Rock and Dean and Mrs. Reid were introduced ...

TOASTMASTER TATE: President Gill of Colorado College cannot be here to say a few words tonight, but he has sent the Executive Dean of Colorado College to speak to you, a man who has written quite extensively in the field of history, and who is Dean of the College and a specialist in history. I understand he has written a book called "Doctors in Blue," which is a study of the services of the Union doctors in the late unpleasantness. [Laughter] I am very anxious personally to get a copy of that book which has been published, because I had two grandfathers and five great-uncles who spent five years creating surgical experience for those doctors. [Laughter] I want to introduce Dr. George Adams, Dean of the College of Colorado College. [Applause]

DEAN GEORGE W. ADAMS (Colorado College): Mr. Toastmaster, Ladies and Gentlemen: My president is particularly unhappy not to be able to be here with you. That is true not only because of a severe sore throat, a most unpleasant thing to have, it is true also because the reports he heard of your sessions have sounded most interesting to him, and have certainly seemed interesting to me.

We have been very anxious to have you happy here. As I told you the other day, Juan has done everything in his power to try to make things click. I think the hotel has certainly done its part. I do want to apologize about the weather, because what we have given you is typical Colorado Springs January weather, and here it is April. You have a right to expect that it would be warmer. If you come back next January, you can test the truth of my remarks, and I am sure the Broadmoor will be more than glad to make reservations for you.

We do hope you have not been annoyed by pests. One of the interesting things about our high altitude, our thin air and sunshine is that pests are at a minimum. There are no fleas to be found in the region -- if a dog scratches it's because his skin is too dry; we don't have silverfish; we don't have cockroaches; there are practically no house flies. I have seen only three mosquitoes since I moved here three years ago. We are free of almost every pest, except the inhabitants. The inhabitants have a way of declaiming the wonders of their region and forcing it upon visitors in a manner almost as offensive as that of California's. I do hope you haven't been too much annoyed by that sort of thing. [Laughter]

I realize you did not come to hear me tonight. We are going to hear a very distinguished educational statesman in the person of Mr. Jacobs, so I will repeat that Colorado College has been most happy to have you here. [Applause]

... Applause as the following people were introduced: Dean and Mrs. Scott Goodnight; Dean and Mrs. Gardner; Dean and Mrs. Thompson, University of Nebraska ...

TOASTMASTER TATE: The next man I want to ask to say a few words is a person who has made one of our famous American colloquial poets quite well known. I want Dean George Davis and Mrs. Davis to stand, and I want Dean Davis to tell us a story. [Applause as they arose]

DEAN DAVIS: If you will recall, just about a year ago I named a new Chancellor of Purdue University. [Laughter] And you will note that I am no longer associated with them. [Laughter] Bill asked me to read one of Riley's poems, and as I thought over the various things he wrote and thought of the delicious weather we are having, I couldn't think of anything more appropriate than "Hoosier Spring Poetry."

... Dean Davis delivered a beautiful recitation of James Whitcomb Riley's "Hoosier Spring Poetry" ...

TOASTMASTER TATE: Thank you, Dean Davis. I wish Dean Davis had taken time and told some other stories about our great Hoosier poet. We can't match him by anything comparable in Georgia. You know, we do have one character down there that made Uncle Remus famous, the stories told by the old man who lived in the cabin on the farm and who entertained the little white boy who came down after supper, while Uncle Remus had a fire roaring. One of the famous stories is, of course, Br'er Rabbit and The Tar Baby."

... Toastmaster Tate then delivered a very entertaining rendition of the story of "Br'er Rabbit and The Tar Baby" ...

TOASTMASTER TATE: I believe I have introduced just about everybody at the head table here. Tonight we have a man with us who, I believe, is a Republican, although I hope he did not understand the point of my joke. [Laughter]

Dr. Albert Jacobs was born in Birmingham, Michigan, north of the Mason-Dixon line. [Laughter] He received his Bachelor's degree in this country and went to Oxford as a Rhodes scholar, and taught at Oxford University. When he came back to this country he took law and taught law at Columbia University, where he was Professor for a number of years, writing books particularly on family relationships and on the relationships of tenant and landowner. He was assistant to President Eisenhower there. In recent years he has come to the University of Denver as its President. I introduce, with great pleasure, to you Dr. Albert Jacobs. [Applause]

DR. ALBERT C. JACOBS (Chancellor, University of Denver): Mr. Toastmaster, President Blair, Members of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and Guests: It is a high honor to attend your annual banquet. Mrs. Jacobs and I deeply appreciate the warmth of your hospitality.

In looking around the room, I find I am no stranger. Your fine President, now the distinguished leader of Denison University, is a warm and esteemed friend. And I see several colleagues. Wherever I turn at the University I find members of your Association: Dan Feder, my right hand man without whose splendid help I could not carry on; "Tad" Wieman, formerly Dean of Men and Director of Athletics and Physical Education at the University of Maine, now our outstanding Director of Athletics; and Carroll Galbreath, our very able Acting Dean of Students. I sincerely wish that I were so well fortified in other areas.

I have chosen for my topic: "The Student -- Who Cares about him?" I discuss this important phase of education with

humility, recalling the story Bennet Cerf tells on Alexander Meikeljohn when the latter was President of Amherst. Having spoken in Kansas City concerning the blessings on university training, he was chagrined the next morning with the newspaper headline: "Meikeljohn shows the need of college education."

When Dan returned from your meeting of a year ago in St. Louis, he spoke with great enthusiasm concerning the actions of your Association. They add up to saying to college presidents: "See here, we're not a part of a side show in this higher education circus. We deserve a place in the main tent. There are unique aspects of this program which require professional attention as fully as the classroom. From the standpoint of the student and society these must be approached with skill, understanding and ethics. We serve, therefore, not only the student, but the faculty, administration and the whole educational community in structuring the student's educational experience."

Thus do I paraphrase the mandate of your Association.

As a harrassed university administrator, I see in this statement a distinct departure from the original student personnel program. This departure is not a revolutionary one, but rather the result of evolution. In early days the program was concerned primarily with "welfare" and discipline. The first functions of those later known as Deans of Men were to see that students were in their dormitories at certain hours, that they observed proper rules of decorum both on the campus and in their community relationships, and that such conduct was enforced by appropriate disciplinary measures.

The past three decades have witnessed the evolution I mentioned. This as I see it, is largely the result of the impact upon your work of the new learning provided through psychology, sociology and the related social sciences leading to a better understanding of man and his functions. You are the best witnesses of this progress. We must, however, be frank in admitting that many college administrators are still expecting of you a type of police function. They regard you as primarily responsible for the "welfare" and the discipline of the student body.

They hold you responsible when, as recently happened at one university, a student uprising resulted in prankishness leading to destruction. The president of that institution undoubtedly called upon the Dean of Students for an accounting, asking what factors gave rise to this demonstration. His concern, I am sure, was not why the prankishness started, but rather why it was not sufficiently controlled. You are probably equally mystified as to the cause of such behavior. There are of course all sorts of

esoteric psychological and sociological explanations. Maybe we can get by with blaming it on spring.

Whatever the explanation, the fact remains that youth will probably always do such things. When they do you ask yourselves where have we failed in the education process -- in inculcating values so that students can distinguish between fun and destruction; in developing responsibility and respect for the rights and property of others? Obviously, we cannot place all the blame for this on education. Yet, as a matter of fact, those of us who believe in education and in the importance of its functions see in it a solution for the ills of the world. Therefore, we are willing to accept these responsibilities and are inclined to blame ourselves for such campus occurrences. However, we must be careful always to act as Alma Mater in the highest sense and not fall into a phase of Alma Maternalism.

And, characteristically, the president looks to those charged with the responsibility for and the welfare and behavior of the student body for an explanation. Similarly he looks to them when he feels some discipline is necessary. The faculty feel much the same. All too often we do not recognize that some of the factors which contribute to this type of negative behavior may be the combination of what has happened in the classroom and of what are overall administrative policies. As a result, the student personnel worker is often caught in the middle between situations created by the faculty and those in which the administration has had a part, situations with which he must live and for which he must find a solution.

A three-fold distribution of functions and responsibilities exists in any institution. The faculty are responsible for what happens in the classroom, for the academic program; the administration for the broad policies of the institution and for its day-to-day operations. Administrators are a necessary evil any institution must accept; their sole justification for existence is to facilitate the role of student and teacher. In the middle is a sort of no man's land which we have come to regard as the area of student personnel services.

But we all have just one goal -- the training of our youth to become intelligent citizens and leaders capable of distinguishing between right and wrong, of preserving the freedoms on which our nation was founded. And this goal has never been more important than today when the world is engaged in a life-death struggle of prolonged duration between freedom and totalitarianism; when in the successful outcome of that conflict our strongest force is not military might (important as it is and will be for years to come), but our citizens -- their learning,

knowledge and skills; the devotion of their best efforts to the objects of their endeavor; their integrity and honesty; their assumption of the full responsibilities of citizenship.

In many institutions a well-defined and well-recognized area of responsibility for student personnel work remains. There is still a widespread feeling that this program is a function of the faculty. It is not uncommon to find many college presidents as well as faculties convinced that the counseling function is being carried on adequately by the faculty. In no way do I underestimate the ability of faculty members to get close to students. But it is too much to expect them to have the time and to have acquired the specific skills, techniques and understandings necessary to effective working with students as individuals and in groups.

The individual entrusted with the responsibilities of the student personnel program must first and foremost have a well-balanced personality, high ethical and moral standards; he must inspire respect and affection on the part of students. To him they look for an example during their college days, and later with either fondness and respect or disdain and even loathing.

But all connected with the education of youth carry this high responsibility. By the very nature of your contacts, essentially outside the classroom, you have a greater opportunity for intimate association with and an understanding of the students. Therefore, you have a greater responsibility for what you mean to them and for the effect you have upon them in personal ways.

You have every right to regard the elements of your professional skill, requisite for the successful performance of your job, as very definite essentials of the special educational discipline of which you are a part. You have a right, therefore, to feel that yours is an area of service which is not to be invaded by anyone and everyone connected with the institution. You have the right to demand that all who would seek to perform your particular services, must have some professional orientation therein and understanding thereof. Teachers do not enter the classroom without professional skills.

With this recognition of yourselves as a professional group, how well are you getting the job done? Let me view your situation in terms of an administrator on the outside looking in. On the basis of individual experiences many will undoubtedly disagree with what I shall say. My remarks are no reflection upon you nor upon my colleagues. I am merely trying to summarize in rather broad strokes some impressions I have gained on my own

campus and at other institutions. I do not mean to step on toes, but if the shoe pinches here and there, I shall have served the function of thought stimulation.

You are doing a significant job well. I congratulate you thereon. Speaking thus to a professional group that indulges in the most penetrating self-analysis, reminds me of the minister who, reviewing a Sunday service with his wife, said: "Well, I really read them the riot act this morning. I told the congregation how important it was for them to come to church on Sundays and what they were missing by not doing so." To which his wife, with the usual deflationary tendency, replied: "Yes, dear, but do you realize you were reading the riot act to the very persons who did not need to hear it and missing those who did need to hear it?"

Well, maybe our situation here tonight is much the same. I need not elaborate further. Thus, while realizing that my remarks may be old stuff to you, I shall review the concerns of some college presidents.

Too much of your time, it seems, is still spent in running to and in putting out fires, instead of in long range plans and operations for preventive education and fire-proofing. Even a great deal of your professional meeting time, as I scan your program, still seems to be devoted to a discussion and study of "problems". They will always be with us. But they will be with us in greater or lesser degree according to the extent to which our long-range educational planning and functioning does its job in making constructive, mature and responsible citizens out of our student youth. As long as you regard your job as that of keeping peace in the college community, as primarily responsible for catching the malefactor and administering proper discipline, as long as you are content to sit back and feel that a good job is being done while campus peace and quiet prevail, just so long are you in the process of putting out fires. As professional educators, devoted to the life adjustment of the students, examine your programs in the terms of the various potentialities for education so that such "problems" will arise with decreasing frequency and severity. You must so plan the educational program that in place of these problem situations, there will be a concerted effort towards worthwhile and constructive activities, activities which will give youth the same outlets for their interest and energies as they now find in destructive action. Your support of "Help-Week" instead of "Hell-Week" is a significant step along the right road.

And, to what extent are you coordinating the program of extra-curricular activities to the experiences the student has in

the classroom? Such programs are the natural outgrowth of the interests of students. Therefore to students generally they are programs on which they will devote unlimited time and energy without the need of exterior motivation. What I am speaking of calls for, on your part, a very direct effort to integrate your functions with those of the other members of the University family. Sometimes the program with which you are charged is carried on quite independent of and almost without recognition of the fact that there are other daily experiences going on in the classroom. These experiences have or should have just as much meaning for the student as those activities which he undertakes in his own spirited enthusiasm. Yet, how can the faculty member make his education more realistic? Surely there are manifold opportunities in the activities which the student will carry on outside the classroom if only there is the adequate opportunity for cooperation. What I am suggesting is, I realize, not easy of accomplishment, but merits concerted effort.

Looking at the totality of our educational program, I have stressed the importance of integration of the classroom experience with the extra-curricular life of the student body. To be very frank, I cannot but feel that much of the difficulty in the situation stems from the actions of your own professional people in so circumscribing themselves and their area of operations as to exclude the faculty therefrom. It is almost as if you had set up a separate empire and had told both faculty and administration to "lay" off; that this is your particular bailiwick and you wish to have full and uninterfered-with responsibility.

In higher education there is no such thing as an individual empire. All of us must be dedicated to service of the whole student. To the extent to which you attempt to circumscribe your areas and to exclude yourselves from intimate contact with the faculty, you are creating an empire and defeating your basic objectives in higher education.

To be sure, I am well aware that all of this is not one-sided. I realize there is a tendency on the part of the faculty member to concern himself primarily with his subject matter, his research, his writing and his teaching in the classroom, and to say, in effect, that he wants no part of the other life of the institution. But this all the more stresses the importance of your doing the thing which the faculty member needs in order to reach his full effectiveness in the institutional setting. It stresses the importance of your reaching out and drawing the faculty member into these intimate relationships with the students -- whether it be at the level of counseling him with understanding and sympathy in his classroom situation, or in attending

the social functions to which students invite him. Certainly, it calls for a well-integrated, well-planned and aggressive program of drawing upon faculty members when they can serve with information useful and essential to the counseling process. And it calls for a return road of that information from you and your professional cohorts. You must supply the faculty with the kind of information about their students which they ought to have to enable them to do the most understanding and useful job in the classroom. To my mind this is one of the most crucial and most needed areas for your future operations. Would not an annual bulletin prepared for the faculty by your office interpreting and analyzing the entire student body be of great help?

Unless your student personnel program is integrated with the classroom, the faculty and the administration, then no fancy line diagrams or organizational structures will be effective. Unless you are working with all of the institution, you are in effect working in a vacuum.

I now turn to a problem which causes me great concern. I refer to the program of extra-curricular activities (a term I do not like) and what you see in it of educational value. All too often the extra-curricular activity program (I prefer additional curricular) is designed primarily as an outlet for energies and interests of students, too frequently without reference to educational values. It would seem possible to structure these experiences in terms of significant educational outcome. It is not sufficient justification for extensive programs in this area that they merely provide constructive outlets for students. The outcomes must be genuinely meaningful from an educational point of view. And never has this been more important than today when the future of the free world depends upon the citizens of tomorrow.

Have you attempted to evaluate these programs in terms of their contribution to the lives and the education of students? Ask yourselves whether these social functions, these additional curricular activities in journalism, the year book, and in student government itself, insure valid educational outcomes. These programs, I fear, are too much for the sake of the activities themselves, a kind of busy work designed to keep boys and girls off the streets and out of mischief. They are not thought of as long range educational experiences which will have significance many years after college.

I wish now briefly to look at the area of fraternity life. I recall my undergraduate days and my fraternity connections with deep appreciation and warm affection. The friendships there formed are among my most cherished possessions.

I believe in fraternities. This, I want to make very clear. They have an unparalleled opportunity to train the citizens and leaders our nation so direly needs. And I recognize the strength they have given to their colleges and universities. Across the country fraternity men have traditionally in later years been the strongest supporters and builders of Alma Mater.

I am concerned over the attacks currently being made upon the whole fraternity system. I am concerned because I do not want to lose the values of sound fraternity life. Many attacks, it is true, are made by persons who have no proper basis for evaluation.

But let us face it; some of the attacks are justified. I have been deeply concerned over fraternity scholarship. I do not ask for an all "A" record. But a chapter whose average is below that of the male student body cannot justify its continuance. I am concerned too that on many campuses today the snobbish attitude prevails that anyone to be anybody must belong to a fraternity. While many students do not need or desire the experiences a college fraternity can provide, an equal number could gain much from the intimate contact of fraternity life. Too often, in electing to membership, a chapter will adhere to a pattern already set and not seek out the young men fraternities could help so much to realize their potential as future leaders.

Have you attempted to set for the organized groups on your campus the high standards of citizenship and personal behavior which ought to be present in such group situations? It is not enough merely to tolerate fraternities. If they are to be a part of our American educational life, they must be thoroughly integrated with the entire institutional philosophy and must take their place as responsible groups on the campus. They must realize their great potential in training for citizenship and leadership. They must justify their existence. To me this is not a debatable issue. But it is, I realize, in many circles. The fraternity owes its first allegiance and obligation, let us not forget, to Alma Mater. If it cannot become a part of the institutional mores, if it cannot adapt itself to the policies, philosophy and standards of the institution, it has no place on the campus.

In our national fraternities we exemplify too much the paternalism of the past hundred years. Education is designed through appropriate understandings and experiences to produce self-determining, independent citizens. Yet all too often fraternity conventions are dominated by alumni who would let the long dead hand of the past continue to hold sway over the lives of vigorous, up and coming generations. It is high time that we

recognize the need for a greater amount of self determination of fraternity policy, the part of the active generations of membership. I ask you, therefore, to what extent you have made a concerted effort to educate alumni as well as your active chapter in the need for this development. Have you, in your various contacts given ear to the voice of the current generations, or have you assumed blandly that we know what is best for these boys and we therefore are the ones to make the policies? Are you aware of the rising revolt within fraternity circles against this type of domination? And, if you are aware of it, what are you doing about it?

The Dean of Students, whatever his title, must in a very real sense be the president's chief lieutenant in student relationships. He must have his finger on the pulse of student sentiment, student behavior and student reaction. He must convey this pulse regularly and accurately to his president and to other members of the administration and faculty. To the extent to which he does this, he will have a real impact upon the institution.

Here again, I am referring to the importance of the student personnel worker coming out of his shell and recognizing that his "empire" is the total institution and its impact upon the student. I challenge you therefore to think again in terms of the broad relationships with your student body as well as with your colleagues. How sure are you that you know what is going on in the minds of your students? Do you in truth have your finger on the pulse of student sentiment? Can you reflect accurately to your president what is the attitude of the student concerning the various policies of the institution? Have you found out what students think on these matters, or are you telling your president what you think they ought to think?

I cannot answer these questions for you. Obviously, I can say only that this is what I expect of my chief student personnel administrator. For, I have no other way of getting quite so directly and without the usual inhibitions which occur in conventional meetings with students their true sentiments about the institution.

Perhaps you can answer this question in terms of whether or not your student body feel it necessary to use other channels for communicating their concerns and problems rather than coming through your office. If such is the case, then in truth you do not have your finger on the pulse of the student body. If, however, your student body sees in you the channel for bringing their voice to the attention of the administration, then you are rendering significant service. A leading education has termed the

student personnel program the fifth wheel, and, yes, the steering wheel.

Let me summarize what I have been trying to say not by reiteration of major points, but rather by pointing out again the high mission for which all education exists. Ours is the job of preparing for the world, for our nation, for our local communities citizens with strong moral fibre, citizens constructively critical not only of what goes on about them, but of themselves as well, citizens aware of their community and its needs, who extend this awareness to the entire world. Ours is the job of inculcating the students with a sense of high moral values and with a deep sense of responsibility for the freedoms they enjoy.

It is fully as important for you therefore to recognize that your job is that of teaching as it is for the faculty member in the classroom to be aware of the necessity for interpreting to the students the life realities of his subject matter, however remote it may momentarily appear to be in terms of the world about us. To be sure, you are student personnel workers, representing a specialized phase of the educational experience. More fundamentally, you are educators. And as educators you constantly must be aware of the necessity for evaluating what you do in terms of its effect upon the total educational experience of the student.

Yours is not merely an emergency function. Yours is not merely a supplement to the total educational mainstream. Your part in this whole educational picture is as integral as any other. When you regard yourselves in this light, and when you function accordingly, then you need have no concern about finding the proper place in the sun. Your place will have been made. It will be appreciated alike by students, faculty and administration. But again I stress -- this will not be accomplished by any miracle of acceptance and understanding. It will be accomplished only by your own efforts -- in reaching out to the faculty and to the administration -- in educating them in the significance of what you are doing as educators first and foremost.

"The Student -- Who Cares About Him?" It is your task to see that the concern is that of every part of the university.

I thank you very much. [Prolonged applause]

TOASTMASTER TATE: Dr. Jacobs, on behalf of this group and the Executive Committee, we want to thank you for your fine talk. It will be made a part of the minutes of this assembly, and when we go back to our campuses we will read not only your words of appreciation for what we are doing, but your words of

caution for those things which we are not doing.

I want to introduce Mrs. Jacobs, and ask her to take a bow. [Applause as she arose]

Through the courtesy of Colorado College, we are to have some musical numbers now. I want to ask Dr. Max Lanner to stand please. This gentleman is Director and head of the Department of Music of Colorado College, and a professional concert pianist. We are certainly delighted to have you with us, Dr. Lanner, and I believe you will announce your own program.

... The audience was superbly entertained by the magnificent artistry of Dr. Max Lanner at the piano ...

TOASTMASTER TATE: Thank you ever so much. That applause expresses our appreciation. Thank you, and good night.

... The Banquet session recessed at ten o'clock ...

SATURDAY MORNING SESSION

April 5, 1952

The Conference reconvened at eleven-five o'clock, President Knapp presiding.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Shall we come to order please.

... Convention announcements ...

SECRETARY TURNER: For those who are not here and would like a Conference photograph, I will put the name of the photographer in the next Newsletter, and how they can get their picture. Leave your badges on the porch and we'll use them next year.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: I understand there are some resolutions to be considered from the discussions this morning.

DEAN JOHN H. STIBBS (Tulane University): As Chairman of the Group 2 meeting this morning, on the privately endowed institutions, I should like to bring a resolution before the general group concerning a newly proposed G.I. bill explained in a memo disseminated by the American Council on Education that came to the attention of some of our members in the group this morning. This is the resolution:

"RESOLVED: That NASPA recommend to the National Council of Education that the proposed G.I. bill which would substitute a monthly cash payment to the veterans in lieu of subsistence and tuition paid to the university as heretofore, be carefully studied for the following reasons:

"1. That the bill would cause discrimination between institutions.

"2. It would increase the administrative costs of colleges and universities through partial payments of tuition.

"3. It would not effectively solve the abuses of the past, as posed by non-accredited institutions and programs.

"4. It would discriminate against the private institutions."

I move the adoption of this resolution and if the group would like to hear some comment and elaboration, I should like to ask Dean Strozier and Dean Arno Haack to speak on this point.

DEAN HAACK: I second the motion.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Open for discussion.

DEAN BALDWIN: What do you mean by "discrimination"? I didn't get that. "Discrimination against private institutions", what did you mean?

DEAN STROZIER: There are several bills that are up for consideration, GI bills for the present veterans. Under the bill that apparently has the endorsement of the American Council there would be direct payment to the student who would select his own school, pay his tuition and subsistence out of what he got. There would be no payment to the school at all. The discrimination against private institutions seems to me obvious under those circumstances because a man in the state of Illinois, for example, would have to take a long time before he chose any of the private institutions -- Chicago, Northwestern, any of the others -- where the tuition is about three times as large as it is at the State University.

But more than that, while I don't think any bill should be passed by the Congress that would be discriminatory against private education (and I would see this bill as discriminatory), the only defense that I have seen offered for the bill is that under the GI bill as it is operated there have been a number of fly-by-night schools that have profited greatly, schools that were not accredited in any way; but this does not seem to me the proper way to meet an abuse. It could have been met administratively by the Veterans Administration. I do not want to criticize the VA, even by implication, in the official note to be sent to the American Council. The American Council has given the impression, however, by the memo signed by the committee, in both public and private institutions, that the American Council favors the direct subsidy. I do not believe that it has been given enough thought by institutions, both public and private. I think that probably some of the business managers of the big institutions think this will be easier than the kind of paper work they have had in the past.

If a man is getting \$110.00 a month and has to pay his tuition, I think he would cause all of us a great many headaches from the standpoint of partial payments, and that the book work would not be reduced at all.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Any further discussion? Do I understand the language of the resolution requests further study, or is it a record of opposition? [The resolution was re-read]

... The question was called for, the motion voted upon, and adopted ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Are there further resolutions? Is there further business?

... Announcement re transportation ...

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Is there further business to come before us? If not, it is my pleasure to turn the gavel over to Vic, and let him close this session.

PRESIDENT-ELECT SPATHELF: Thank you, Blair.

PRESIDENT KNAPP: Good wishes, and best of luck.

PRESIDENT-ELECT SPATHELF: I take it now that the honeymoon is over that I have enjoyed for the last 24 hours. [Laughter] And I take it that after the cloud of battle of this convention has been cleared, the executive board will meet for the first time and we will get down to the business of organizing for another year.

I personally think this has been a very fine convention. It has been most profitable to all of us. If there is no further business, I would like to suggest that we stand in adjournment in appreciation of the splendid leadership and fine services of Blair Knapp, and your Executive Board, and your faithful Secretary up here. If there is no objection, the meeting is so adjourned.

... The entire audience arose and there was prolonged applause ...

... The Conference adjourned at eleven-fifteen o'clock ...

APPENDIX A

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY
March 1, 1951 to March 15, 1952

To the Members of the National
Association of Student Personnel Administrators:

Your Secretary is pleased to present the Report of the Secretary of the Association (to which is appended the Report of the Treasurer) for the period March 15, 1951 to March 15, 1952.

Membership in the Association

For the sixth consecutive year, the membership has increased and now stands at an all-time high of 215 member institutions. The rate of growth since 1947 has been surprising: 1947, 130; 1948, 151; 1949, 171; 1950, 185; 1951, 201; and 1952, 215. The analysis of membership in 1952 is as follows:

1951 Membership	201
Member institutions added in 1951-52 ...	17
	<u>218</u>
Member institutions dropped in 1951-52..	4
1952 Membership	214
Institution with membership in process .	1
TOTAL	<u>215</u>

Institutions represented are in forty-eight states, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii.

Memberships Resigned in 1951-52

Four institutions have resigned their memberships during the year, all giving economy measures as their reasons. These were:

Antioch College	Yellow Springs, Ohio
Centre College of Kentucky	Danville, Kentucky
Citadel, The	Charleston, South Carolina
Elizabethtown College	Elizabethtown, Pennsylvania

New Members of the Association

Seventeen new member institutions have been approved during the period, and an eighteenth is in process as of this date. These institutions are:

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Representative</u>
Alma College	Alma, Michigan	William Stielstra

Brandeis University	Waltham, Mass.	Charles Duhig, Director of Student Personnel
City College of New York	New York, New York	Daniel F. Brophy
Colorado Agriculture and Mechanical College	Fort Collins, Colo.	J. C. Clevenger, Dean of Students
Florida Agricultural & Mechanical College	Tallahassee, Fla.	B. L. Perry
Franklin and Marshall College	Lancaster, Pa.	A. G. Breidenstine, Dean of College
Georgetown University	Washington, D. C.	Joseph A. Rock, S.J., Director of Student Personnel
Grinnell College	Grinnell, Iowa	G. L. Duke
Hawaii, Univ. of	Honolulu, Hawaii	Willard Wilson, Dean of Student Personnel
Huntingdon College	Montgomery, Ala.	R. Glenn Massengale
Kansas State College	Manhattan, Kansas	William G. Craig, Dean of Students
Loyola University of New Orleans	New Orleans, La.	Anthony C. O'Flynn, S. J.
North Dakota, Univ. of	Grand Forks, N. D.	Donald J. Robertson, Dean of Student Affairs
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Henry Q. Middendorf, Dean of Students
Rice Institute, The	Houston, Texas	Guy T. McBride, Dean of Students
South Carolina, Univ. of	Columbia, S. C.	J. B. Jackson
Taylor University	Upland, Indiana	C. C. Decker, Director of Personnel

Membership in Process

Howard University	Washington, D. C.	A. J. Blackburn, Dean of Students
-------------------	-------------------	-----------------------------------

Deaths of Members

Your Secretary has reported to you with great regret the deaths of three of our members:

Dean Christian Gauss, Emeritus, Princeton University, at Princeton on November 1, 1951.

Dean Arthur Ray Warnock, Emeritus, Pennsylvania State College, at State College, November 4, 1951.

Dean Leslie I. Reed, Emeritus, Iowa State Teachers College, at Seattle, Washington, on July 19, 1948. (Dean Reed was one of the six men who met at Madison at Conference Number One in 1919; we regret the late report of his

death, which information was secured only by accident.)

Appointments and Promotions

Numerous appointments and promotions of members and associates have been reported to the membership, the most significant including:

From Dean to President	3
From Dean to Vice President to President	1
From Dean to Vice President	3
From Dean of Men to Dean of Students	4
From Assistant Dean to Dean of Students	2

Members on Foreign Duty Assignments

Four of our members have been honored by assignment to foreign duty during the year:

Dean Wesley P. Lloyd, Brigham Young University, Directing the Counseling and Guidance Institute in Japan. Assistant Dean Gordon Klopff, Wisconsin, has been with Dean Lloyd in Japan.

Dean Wray Congdon, Lehigh, on special assignment in Germany for the Department of State.

Dean Norman Nordstrand, St. Olaf, to Oslo, Norway, as Cultural Attache at the U. S. Embassy.

Dean Robert M. Strozier, University of Chicago has served the Department of State in the United States by two extended surveys of foreign student situations in American colleges and universities. Dean Strozier was honored by the government of France on December 4, 1951, by election to the Legion of Honor.

Association Represented at Numerous Conferences and Meetings

The Association has been invited to send representatives and to participate in numerous conferences and meetings during the year:

UNESCO

American Council on Education (3)

National Education Association (2)

National Association of Registrars and Admissions Officers

National Association of Foreign Students Advisers (General Conference and Executive Committee meeting)

Association of College Admission Counselors

Conference of Orientation Week Directors
 American College Health Association
 Conference on College Fraternities and Societies
 National Independent Students Association
 National Interfraternity Conference
 National Students Association
 Northwest Council of Guidance and Personnel
 Fourth Allerton Conference
 Colorado Leadership Conference
 Inaugurations (7)
 Centennial Celebrations (1)

State and Regional Meetings

Nine state and regional meetings have been reported. Doubtless there have been others which have not been called to our attention. Six state meetings in Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas were included; three regional meetings of large size and importance were New England, Eastern Association and Southern.

Reports to the Association

We have continued to report to the membership information concerning crooks, criminals, and confidence men (and women) operating among students. We report these through the News Letter and twice have issued special notices to member deans in regions where certain activities were in operation.

Included have been warnings on check artists, magazine salesmen, clothing salesmen, book salesmen, fake photographer (this one a criminal using photography as a means to the old hair cutting act), and a student social register.

We are attempting to get more information on the new Campus Leader proposition coming out of Beverly Hills, California, and which has apparently flooded the country with its proposals. The "publisher" has answered our letters, has recommended himself highly, and has ignored two requests for references to whom we may write concerning his integrity and responsibility.

Publications

The Proceedings of our 1951 Conference were published and distributed directly from Chicago by our Reporter, Leo Isen, and were in the mail within a month after the Conference. This method represents not only a great saving in time, but a great saving in money since the stenotype report is transcribed directly to stencils for reproduction.

Immediately after the 1951 Conference, a small, dignified printed announcement of the change of name of the Association was prepared, and approximately 1,000 copies were mailed to the Presidents of member and non-member institutions and to numerous professional associations.

Sixteen regular and special News Letters have been prepared, and we have appended useful reports and statements of policy in several instances.

One hundred and three publications have been reviewed briefly, and copies have been secured for general distribution of some of these publications.

Placement Service

The Informal Placement Service has been continued through the year with additional registrations and modest success in placement of individuals.

Your Secretary has been attempting since January 1, 1952, to clear the placement files of all older and inactive listings. This work is not completed at this time, but when completed will remove from your files a surprising number of persons, a number of whom report at this time their appreciation for the service which led them to their present positions but which they neglected to mention earlier. Prior to this campaign to clear the files, the report from March 15, 1951, to January 1, 1952, showed:

	<u>Listed</u>	<u>Placed and Withdrawn</u>	<u>Available</u>
Status at March 15, 1951	235	106	129
Registered and Placed to January 1, 1952	<u>13</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>
Status at January 1, 1952	<u>248</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>137</u>

Meetings of Officers and Executive Committee

Your officers and executive committee have made unusual efforts during this critical year to add several conferences to the heavy exchange of correspondence which has been carried on.

President Knapp and Vice President Strozier met in Chicago on September 6; President Knapp, Vice President Strozier and your Secretary met at Granville, Ohio, on October 12, and

again in Chicago on March 14. A quorum of the Executive Committee, Chairman Spathelf and members of Commission No. I, also Chairman Newhouse of Commission No. II met in Chicago on January 26, 1952.

Plans for the 1952 Conference

Your Secretary would be remiss if he did not mention the generous, faithful, and conscientious help and cooperation we have had from Dean Juan Reid of Colorado College in making plans for our 1952 Conference. No detail has been too small for Dean Reid to ignore -- no detail too large to carry out without questions.

In Conclusion

Your Secretary is completing his fifth three-year term as Secretary of this Association. When we began this duty in 1937, the National Association of Deans and Advisers of Men was an Association with 83 members from institutions in 35 states. Seventy-three member representatives were Deans or Advisers of Men or Deans of Colleges: ten were Deans of Students. Today we have 215 member institutions in all states, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators lists as member representatives 85 Deans of Students, Directors of Student Life, or similar titles, and 130 Deans, Counselors, and Advisers of Men. We can take honest pride in the fact that no institution has ever been invited to become a member of our Association -- further, that your Executive Committee has never rejected the application of a qualified institution.

In spite of this rather remarkable growth, the Association has made genuine efforts to maintain the spirit of friendliness and warmth of communication which has characterized the group through the years. We hope that it is never lost.

Your Secretary would thank the many members who have cooperated with the Secretary with reports, items for the News Letters, prompt answers to our many requests for help or information, and with patience and tolerance for our delays and failures.

Your Secretary believes that we can honestly state that the Association stands high in respect, recognition, and interest not only from its members, but from non-members and fellow professional organizations.

Respectfully submitted,
FRED H. TURNER, Secretary

TREASURER'S REPORT

March 15, 1951 to March 15, 1952

RECEIPTS

Balance on Hand March 15, 1951	\$	986.36	
Dues Collected 1952-53		15.00	
Dues Collected 1951-52		2,955.00	
Dues Collected 1950-51		120.00	
Dues Collected 1949-50		15.00	
Dues Collected 1948-49		12.00	
Receipts from sale of Small Bibliography		3.00	
Receipts from sale of Proceedings		17.00	
Registration Fee		13.00	
Receipts from sale of Banquet and Luncheon Tickets		1,520.75	
Receipts from sale of Bus Tickets		48.75	
Receipts from sale of Residence Hall Bulletins		3.20	
Cash used for change at Conference		25.00	
Subscription to Mailing List		3.00	
Error in Bookkeeping30	
Loan from Champaign National Bank		1,000.00	\$6,737.36

DISBURSEMENTS

Telegrams and Telephone	\$	34.63
Stationery		78.00
Programs and Registration Cards		146.50
Mimeographing		172.62
Stenographic Service		50.00
Reporting and Mimeographing 1951 Proceedings.		1,588.70
Membership Dues (American Council on Education)		25.00
Magazine Subscription		5.00
Expenses to Meetings:		
To N.C.C.F.&S. (Somerville \$5.50; Bishop \$14.80)		
To Washington (Knapp \$27.50)		47.80
Cash for change at Meeting		25.00
Residence Hall Bulletins		71.75
Champaign National Bank for repayment of loan		1,000.00
Champaign National Bank for interest on loan.		6.12
Badges and Ribbons		36.86
Flowers for Dean Warnock and Mrs. Gauss		16.60
Cards Advising of Change of Name of Association		34.00
Expenses of St. Louis Meeting:		
Doctor Brown, speaker	\$	150.00
Tips		3.75
Picture of Convention		2.00
Express on Supplies		7.00

Expenses of St. Louis Meeting (Cont'd.)

Bus Fares	\$ 48.75	
189 Luncheons at Hotel	519.75	
181 Banquets at Hotel	995.50	
Doctor Brown's Room	5.10	
Mimeographing at Conference	35.78	
Chase Hotel, Conference Room	62.50	
Meals for Guests	26.53	
2 Luncheon Guests	5.50	
19 Banquet Guests	<u>104.50</u>	\$1,966.66
Secretary Salary		50.00
Postage		178.98
Bank Debits		6.57
Gavel and Ribbons		<u>13.73</u>
		<u>5,554.52</u>
BALANCE ON HAND MARCH 15, 1952		\$1,182.84

APPENDIX B

OFFICIAL ROSTER OF THOSE IN ATTENDANCE AT
THE COLORADO SPRINGS MEETING

<u>Name</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Title</u>
Adams, George W.	Colorado College	Dean of the College
Alden, V. R.	Harvard Grad. School of Business Admin.	Director of Student Financial Aid
Alter, Foster E.	University of Miami	Dean of Men
Askew, J. Thomas	University of Georgia	Dean of Students
Balch, Richard L.	Stanford University	Chief Counselor for Men
Baldwin, Frank C.	Cornell University	Dean of Men
Ballif, John L.	University of Utah	Dean of Men
Beaty, R. C.	University of Florida	Dean of Men
Benz, Stanley C.	San Jose State College	Dean of Men
Biddle, Theodore W.	University of Pittsburgh	Dean of Men
Bing, Roland	A.&M. College of Texas	Manager of Publica- tions
Bishop, R. W.	Univ. of Cincinnati	Dean of Men
Blaesser, W. W.	U.S. Office of Education	Specialist, Student Personnel Programs
Blunk, W. D.	University of Texas	Assoc. Dean of Student Life
Boocock, C. B.	Rutgers University	Dean of Men
Bosworth, E. F.	Oberlin College	Dean of Men
Bowditch, E. Francis	Mass. Institute of Tech.	Dean of Students
Bredt, Carl V.	University of Texas	Associate Dean of Student Life

<u>Name</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Title</u>
Burdin, L. Gray	Butler University	Dean of Men
Burger, Wm. V.	Colorado School of Mines	Dean of Students
Carlson, Harry G.	University of Colorado	Dean of Men
Cherrington, Ben	Institute of Inter- national Education	Regional Director
Clevenger, J. C.	Colorado A.&M. College	Dean of Students
Clippinger, F. W.	Drury College	Dean of Men
Cloyd, E. L.	No. Car. State College	Dean of Students
Congdon, Wray H.	Lehigh University	Dean of Students
Conklin, Arch B.	Bowling Green State Univ.	Dean of Students
Connole, Paul H.	Washington University	Asst. Dean of Students
Culver, M. S.	Union College (Lincoln)	Dean of Men
Davis, Geo. E.	Purdue University	Dir., Div. of Adult Education
Davis, I. Clark	Southern Ill. Univ.	Dean of Men & Dir. of Student Affairs
DeMarino, Dan A.	Penn State College	Asst. Dean of Men
Dentzer, Wm. T.	Univ. of Colorado	Pres., U.S. National Student Association
Dickinson, James A.	Carnegie Institute of Technology	Dean of Students
DuShane, Donald M.	University of Oregon	Dir. of Stud. Affairs
Eaton, Paul C.	California Institute of Technology	Associate Dean
Eppley, Geary	University of Maryland	Dir. of Stud. Welfare
Farnsworth, Dana L.	Mass. Inst. of Tech.	Medical Director
Farrisee, W. J.	Clarkson Col. of Tech.	Dean of the College
Faunce, Dale	University of Iowa	Dean of Students
Feder, D. D.	University of Denver	Dean of Academic Administration
Foy, James E.	Alabama Polytechnic Institute	Acting Director of Student Affairs
French, Arden O.	La. State University	Dean of Men
Fulton, Dudley G.	Northwestern State College	Dean of Students
Gaines, F. Pendleton	So. Methodist Univ.	Dean of Students
Galbreath, Carroll	University of Denver	Dean of Students
Galbraith, Maurice J.	Univ. of Illinois Professional Colleges	Dean of Student Affairs
Gardner, Donfred H.	University of Akron	Dean of Students
Gass, Clinton B.	Nebr. Wesleyan Univ.	Dean of Men
Godolphin, F. R. B.	Princeton University	Dean of the College

<u>Name</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Title</u>
Goodnight, Scott H.	University of Wisconsin	Dean of Men, Emeritus
Graves, Thomas A.	Harvard Grad. School of Business Adm.	Administrative Asst. to the Dean
Griffin, R. S.	University of Nevada	Dean of Men
Guthrie, William S.	Ohio State University	Jr. Dean Arts College
Gwin, John P.	Beloit College	Dean of Students
Haack, Arno J.	Washington University	Dean of Students
Hall, Chaffee E., Jr.	Univ. of California	Asst. Dean of Stud.
Helgen, Henry Jr.	Augustana College	Dean of Men
Helser, M. D.	Iowa State College	Dir. of Personnel
Hocutt, John E.	College of William & Mary	Dean of Men
Holland, Jack	University of Texas	Dean of Men
Hoogesteger, Howard	Lake Forest College	Dean of Men
Howard, John	Palos Verdes College	President
Huit, M. L.	State Univ. of Iowa	Counselor for Men
Hulet, Richard E.	Univ. of Illinois	Asst. Dean of Men
Hunt, Everett	Swarthmore College	Dean
Hunt, Frank R.	Lafayette College	Dean of Students
Hyink, Bernard L.	Univ. of So. Calif.	Dean of Students
Isen, Leo	Bona Fide Reporting Co.	Reporter
Jackson, J. B.	Univ. of So. Carolina	Dean of Men
Jacobs, Albert C.	University of Denver	Chancellor
Jox, Marshall J.	Valparaiso College	Dean of Men
Julian, J. H.	Univ. of So. Dakota	Vice President
Kamm, Robert B.	Drake University	Dean of Students
Keeney, A. L.	Univ. of Wyoming	Dean of Men
King, Tom	Michigan State College	Dean of Students
Knapp, A. Blair	Denison University	President
Knapp, R. H.	Univ. of So. Dakota	Dean of Student Per- sonnel Services
Knox, Carl W.	Northern Illinois State Teachers College	Asst. Dean of Men
Lang, J. C.	Dept. of the Navy	Educational Officer
Lawrence, Dave	Univ. of Louisville	Dean of Men
Lesser, George	Univ. of Colorado	Asst. Dean of Men
Linkins, R. H.	Ill. State Normal Univ.	Dean of Men
Lloyd, Wesley P.	Brigham Young University	Dean of Students
Lowrey, R. G.	Mississippi Southern College	Dir. of Student Wel- fare & Dean of Men
Lucas, John W.	University of Omaha	Dean of Students

<u>Name</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Title</u>
MacMinn, Paul	Univ. of Oklahoma	Dean of Students
Mallett, Donald	Purdue University	Acting Director of Student Affairs
Manchester, R. E.	Kent State University	Dean of Men
Marshall, Graham E.	State Univ. of Iowa	Fraternity Counselor
Maruth, Charles H.	Denver University	Sec.Amer.Assoc. Collegiate Registrars & Admissions Officers
Massey, G. Harold	Wayland College	Dean of Students
Mathany, Howard V.	Univ. of New Mexico	Dean of Men
Matthews, Jack	Univ. of Missouri	Dean of Students
McBride, Guy T.	The Rice Institute	Assoc.Dean for Stud.
Melvin, Harold	Northwestern University	Dean of Students
Miller, Leais G.	University of Wyoming	Asst.to Dean of Men
Miller, M. Warner	Colo. A. & M. College	Counselor for Men
Miner, Robert J.	Miami University	Dir. of Men's Affairs
Moore, Robert	Arkansas State College	Dean of Men
Murray, Robert O.	A.& M. College of Texas	Civilian Counselor
Musser, Malcolm E.	Bucknell University	Dean of Men
Nemeschy, Robert B.	Ohio Wesleyan Univ.	Asst. Dean of Men
Newhouse, Dean S.	Case Inst. of Tech.	Dean of Students
Nowotny, Arno	University of Texas	Dean of Student Life
Nygreen, Glen T.	Univ. of Washington	Exec. Office of Student Affairs
O'Flynn, Anthony C.	Loyola Univ. of New Orleans	Dean of Students
Oglesby, R. R.	Okla. A. & M. College	Dean of Students
Olds, Glenn A., Dr.	University of Denver	Chaplain
Ostafin, Peter A.	Univ. of Michigan	Asst. Dean of Stud.
Peck, G. W.	Univ. of Illinois	Asst. Dean of Men
Pellett, Ray C.	Western Michigan College	Dean of Men
Penberthy, W. L.	Texas A. & M. College	Dean of Men
Pershing, John J.	Ga. Inst. of Tech.	Assoc.Dean of Stud.
Pierson, Harry	National Association of Foreign Student Admin.	
Piskor, Frank	Syracuse University	Dean
Pitman, Paul M.	College of Idaho	President
Pledger, Charles E.	Nat. Interfrat. Conference	Chairman
Poling, Dan	Oregon State College	Dean of Men
Quinn, John F.	Univ. of Rhode Island	Dean of Men
Rea, W. B.	Univ. of Michigan	Assoc. Dean of Stud.
Reid, Juan	Colorado College	Dean of Men

<u>Name</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Title</u>
Richardson, O. T.	Ball State Teachers Col.	Dean of Stud. Aff.
Rieck, Elmer C.	So. Methodist Univ.	Asst. Dean of Stud.
Roberts, O. D.	University of Oklahoma	Counselor of Men
Robertson, Donald J.	Univ. of No. Dakota	Dean of Stud. Aff.
Robinson, David W.	Indiana University	Asst. Headmaster
Rock, Joseph A.	Georgetown University	Director of Student Personnel
Roemmele, Herbert F.	The Cooper Union	Dean of Students
Rollins, J. Leslie	Harvard Grad. School of Business Administration	Assistant Dean
Rollins, J. W.	East Texas State Teachers College	Dean
Ross, Mylin H.	Ohio State University	Asst. Dean of Men
Ryden, George H.	Okla. City University	Dean of Men
Schmidt, Louis G.	Eastern Ill. State College	Dir. Stud. Activ.
Seulberger, F. Geo.	Northwestern University	Dean of Students
Sevrinson, C. A.	No. Dak. Agric. College	Dean & Asst. to Pres.
Shoemaker, John	Univ. of Arkansas	Dean of Men
Shumway, Waldo	Stevens Inst. of Tech.	Dean
Shutt, Darold L.	Marshall College	Dean of Men
Slonaker, Louis	University of Arizona	Dean of Men
Smith, Marc Jack	Univ. of Redlands	Dean of Men
Somerville, J. J.	Ohio Wesleyan Univ.	Dean of Men
Sours, James K.	Municipal Univ. of Wichita	Adm. Asst.
Spathelf, Victor F.	Wayne University	Dean of Stud. Aff.
Spencer, Lee Bowen	Okla. Baptist Univ.	Dean of Men
Stefanik, Henry R.	Miami University	Asst. Director of Men's Affairs
Stafford, E. E.	Univ. of Illinois	Dean of Men
Stewart, Harold E.	Wayne University	Asst. Dean of Student Affairs
Stewart, John E.	University of Maine	Dean of Men
Stibbs, John H.	Tulane University	Dean of Students
Stone, Hurford E.	Univ. of California	Dean of Students
Strozier, Robert M.	University of Chicago	Dean of Students
Tate, William	University of Georgia	Dean of Men
Thompson, Charles H.	University of Wyoming	Supr. Veterans Relations
Thompson, T. J.	University of Nebraska	Dean of Stud. Aff.
Thorburn, Lyle A.	Michigan State College	Counselor for Men
Thorn, Robert E.	Grove City College	Dean of Men, Dir. of Athletics
Trusler, V. T.	Kansas State Teachers College	Dean of Men
Turner, Fred H.	University of Illinois	Dean of Students

<u>Name</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Title</u>
Wacker, Francis	Delta Sigma Phi Frat.	Executive Secretary
Waite, Richard A., Jr.	Rensselaer Poly. Inst.	Dean of Students
Walter, Erich A.	University of Michigan	Dean of Students
Ward, Phillip M.	College of Idaho	Dean of Men
Weaver, Fred H.	Univ. of No. Carolina	Dean of Students
Wedge, Bryant H., Dr.	University of Chicago	Asst. Director, Health Service
Weir, John R.	Calif. Inst. of Tech.	Clinical Psychologist
Wieman, E. E.	University of Denver	Director of Athletics
Wilkins, Taylor	Texas A. & M. College	Asst. Commandant
Williams, Simon R.	Boston University	
Williams, Henry	Colorado College	Asst. Dir. of Admissions
Williamson, E. G.	University of Minnesota	Dean of Students
Winbigler, H. Donald	Stanford University	Dean of Students
Wolfe, David L.	University of Illinois	Asst. Dean of Men
Wolleson, F. A.	Univ. of Illinois Navy Pier Branch	Dean of Students
Woodruff, Laurence C.	University of Kansas	Dean of Men
Wunderlich, Herb J.	Montana State Univ.	Dean of Students
Yarborough, John M.	Stanford University	Head of Student Personnel Service
Young, Ralph A.	College of Wooster	Dean of Men
Zillman, Theo.	University of Wisconsin	Dean of Men
Zimmerman, George H.	Miami University	Counselor

APPENDIX C
ROSTER OF LADIES GROUP

Mrs. Vernon R. Alden	Mrs. A. L. Koeney
Mrs. Harry G. Carlson	Mrs. George Lesser
Mrs. Ben Cherrington	Mrs. R. G. Lowrey
Mrs. J. C. Clevenger	Mrs. Donald Mallett
Mrs. E. L. Cloyd	Mrs. R. E. Manchester
Mrs. George E. Davis	Mrs. G. Harold Massey
Mrs. Dale Faunce	Mrs. Howard V. Mathany
Mrs. Carroll Galbreath	Mrs. Dean S. Newhouse
Mrs. Virginia Gardner	Mrs. Ray C. Pellett
Mrs. Clinton B. Gass	Mrs. John J. Pershing
Mrs. William S. Guthrie	Mrs. Juan Reid
Mrs. John P. Gwin	Mrs. Mylin H. Ross
Mrs. John E. Hocutt	Mrs. E. E. Stafford
Mrs. Everett Hunt	Mrs. John H. Stibbs
Mrs. Leo Isen	Mrs. V. T. Trusler
Mrs. Marshall J. Jox	Mrs. Fred H. Turner
Mrs. J. H. Julian	Mrs. Francis Wacker
Mrs. Robert B. Kamm	Mrs. Erich A. Walter
	Mrs. Fred H. Weaver

APPENDIX D

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Meet- ing Year	Pres- ent	Place	President	Secretary
1 1919	6	Madison, Wisconsin	S.H. Goodnight	L.A. Strauss
2 1920	9	Urbana, Illinois	T.A. Clark	S.H. Goodnight
3 1921	16	Iowa City, Iowa	T.A. Clark	S.H. Goodnight
4 1922	20	Lexington, Kentucky	E.E. Nicholson	S.H. Goodnight
5 1923	17	Lafayette, Indiana	Stanley Coulter	E.E. Nicholson
6 1924	29	Ann Arbor, Michigan	J.A. Bursley	E.E. Nicholson
7 1925	31	Chapel Hill, N. C.	Robert Rienow	F.F. Bradshaw
8 1926	46	Minneapolis, Minn.	C.R. Melcher	F.F. Bradshaw
9 1927	43	Atlanta, Georgia	Floyd Field	F.F. Bradshaw
10 1928	50	Boulder, Colorado	S.H. Goodnight	F.M. Dawson
11 1929	75	Washington, D. C.	G.B. Culver	V.I. Moore
12 1930	64	Fayetteville, Ark.	J.W. Armstrong	V.I. Moore
13 1931	83	Knoxville, Tenn.	W.J. Sanders	V.I. Moore
14 1932	40	Los Angeles, Cal.	V.I. Moore	D.H. Gardner
15 1933	55	Columbus, Ohio	C.E. Edmondson	D.H. Gardner
16 1934	61	Evanston, Illinois	H.E. Lobdell	D.H. Gardner
17 1935	56	Baton Rouge, La.	B.A. Tolbert	D.H. Gardner
18 1936	92	Philadelphia, Pa.	W.E. Alderman	D.H. Gardner
19 1937	80	Austin, Texas	D.S. Lancaster	D.H. Gardner
20 1938	164	Madison, Wisconsin	D.H. Gardner	F.H. Turner
21 1939	87	Roanoke, Virginia	D.H. Gardner	F.H. Turner
22 1940	58	Albuquerque, N. Mex.	F.J. Findlay	F.H. Turner
23 1941	100	Cincinnati, Ohio	J.J. Thompson	F.H. Turner
24 1942	114	Urbana, Illinois	L.S. Corbett	F.H. Turner
25 1943	101	Columbus, Ohio	J.A. Park	F.H. Turner
26 1944	96	Chicago, Illinois	J.H. Julian	F.H. Turner
27 1945	Due to Office of Defense Transportation-			No Meeting Held
28 1946	142	Lafayette, Indiana	Earl J. Miller	F.H. Turner
29 1947	170	Ann Arbor, Michigan	Arno Nowotny	F.H. Turner
30 1948	173	Dallas, Texas	E.L. Cloyd	F.H. Turner
31 1949	217	Highland Park, Ill.	J.H. Newman	F.H. Turner
32 1950	210	Williamsburg, Va.	L.K. Neidlinger	F.H. Turner
33 1951	222	St. Louis, Missouri	W.P. Lloyd	F.H. Turner
34 1952	180	Colo. Springs, Colo.	A.B. Knapp	F.H. Turner

APPENDIX EROSTER OF MEMBERS

Institution	Address	Representative
Agriculture and Mechan- College of Texas	College Station, Texas	W. L. Penberthy
Akron, University of	Akron 4, Ohio	Donfred H. Gardner, Dean of Students
Alabama Polytechnic Institute	Auburn, Alabama	T.C. Clark, Jr., Dir. (on leave to 9/1/52) James Foy, Actg. Dir.
Alabama, University of	University, Alabama	Noble B. Hendrix, Dean of Students
Alaska, University of	College, Alaska	William Cashen
Alfred University	Alfred, New York	Fred H. Gertz
Allegheny College	Meadville, Pa.	C. W. McCracken
Alma College	Alma, Michigan	William Stielstra
Anderson College and Theological Seminary	Anderson, Indiana	Adam W. Miller, Men's Counselor
Arizona State College	Tempe, Arizona	Paul V. Trovillo
Arizona, University of	Tucson, Arizona	A. Louis Slonaker
Arkansas State College	State College, Ark.	Robert Moore
Arkansas, Univ. of	Fayetteville, Ark.	John Earl Shoemaker
Augustana College	Sioux Falls, So. Dak.	Henry M. Helgen, Jr.
Baker University	Baldwin, Kansas	Benjamin A. Gessner
Ball State Teachers Col.	Muncie, Indiana	O. T. Richardson
Beloit College	Beloit, Wisconsin	John P. Gwin, Dean of Students
Bowling Green State University	Bowling Green, Ohio	Arch B. Conklin, Dean of Students
Bradley University	Peoria, Illinois	Leslie H. Tucker, Dean of Students
Brandeis University	Waltham, Massachusetts	Charles Duhig, Dir. of Student Personnel
Brigham Young Univ.	Provo, Utah	Wesley P. Lloyd, Dean of Students
Brown University	Providence, R. I.	Samuel T. Arnold, Provost Robert W. Kenny, Dean of Students
Bucknell University	Lewisburg, Pennsylvania	Malcolm E. Musser
Butler University	Indianapolis, Indiana	L. Gray Burdin, Chair- man of Men's Council

California Institute of Pasadena, California Technology		Franklin Thomas, Dean of Students Paul C. Eaton, Assoc. Dean of Upperclassmen
California, Univ. of	Berkeley, Calif.	H. E. Stone, Dean of Students
Capital University	Columbus, Ohio	Earl Papke
Carleton College	Northfield, Minn.	Frank R. Kille, Dean of College
Carnegie Institute of Technology	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	Merrill E. Jarchow Douglas W. Miner, Dir. of Pers. & Welfare James A. Dickinson, Dean of Students Ben E. David
Carroll College	Waukesha, Wisconsin	John Frederick Jansen
Case Institute of Technology	Cleveland, Ohio	Dean Newhouse, Dean of Students
Chicago, University of	Chicago, Illinois	Robert M. Strozier, Dean of Students
Cincinnati, Univ. of	Cincinnati, Ohio	Robert W. Bishop
City College of New York	New York, New York	Daniel F. Brophy
Clarkson College of Technology	Potsdam, New York	W. J. Farrisee
Colgate University	Hamilton, New York	Carl A. Kallgren
Colorado Agriculture and Mechanical College	Fort Collins, Colorado	J. C. Clevenger, Dean of Students
Colorado College	Colorado Springs, Colorado	Juan Reid
Colorado, University of	Boulder, Colorado	Clifford Houston, Dean of Students
Columbia University	New York, New York	Harry G. Carlson
Concordia Teachers College	River Forest, Illinois	N. M. McKnight Albert G. Huegli, Dean of Students
Cooper Union, The	New York, New York	Herbert F. Roemmele
Cornell University	Ithaca, New York	Frank C. Baldwin
Culver-Stockton College	Canton, Missouri	Eugene Haskins, Acting Dean
Dartmouth College	Hanover, New Hampshire	L. K. Neidlinger
Delaware, University of	Newark, Delaware	J. Fenton Daugherty
Denison University	Granville, Ohio	Francis C. Bayley
Denver University	Denver 10, Colorado	Daniel D. Feder, Dean of Students
DePaul University	Chicago, Illinois	T. J. Wangler
DePauw University	Greencastle, Indiana	Lawrence A. Riggs, Dean of Students Robert H. Farber, Asst. Dean of Students

Doane College	Crete, Nebraska	G. W. Lindberg
Drexel Institute of Technology	Philadelphia, Pa.	L. D. Stratton
Drury College	Springfield, Mo.	Frank W. Clippinger
Duquesne University	Pittsburgh, Pa.	F. J. McNamara
East Carolina State Teachers College	Greenville, North Carolina	W. E. Marshall
East Texas State Teachers College	Commerce, Texas	J. W. Rollins
Eastern Illinois State College	Charleston, Illinois	Louis G. Schmidt
Emory University	Emory University, Georgia	E. H. Rece
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College	Tallahassee, Florida	B. L. Perry
Florida State University	Tallahassee, Florida	J. Broward Culpepper, Dean of Stud. Welfare Otis McBride
Florida, Univ. of	Gainesville, Fla.	R. C. Beaty, Dean of Students
Franklin and Marshall College	Lancaster, Pa.	A. G. Breidenstine, Dean of the College
Fresno State College	Fresno 4, California	Forrest D. Brown, Dean of Students
Georgetown University	Washington, D. C.	Joseph A. Rock, S.J., Dir. of Stud. Personnel
George Washington University	Washington, D. C.	C.M. Farrington, Dir. of Men's Activities
Georgia Institute of Technology	Atlanta, Georgia	George C. Griffin, Dean of Students
Georgia, University of	Athens, Georgia	William Tate
Grinnell College	Grinnell, Iowa	G. L. Duke
Grove City College	Grove City, Pa.	Robert E. Thorn
Hanover College	Hanover, Indiana	E. Mowbray Tate
Harvard College	Cambridge, Mass.	Delmar Leighton, Dean of Students
Hastings College	Hastings, Nebraska	F. E. Weyer
Hawaii, University of	Honolulu, Hawaii	Willard Wilson, Dean of Student Personnel
Hiram College	Hiram, Ohio	Melvin A. Anderson
Howard University	Washington, D. C.	A. J. Blackburn, Dean of Students
Huntingdon College	Montgomery, Alabama	R. Glenn Massengale

Idaho, University of	Moscow, Idaho	Herbert E. Lattig
Illinois Institute of Technology	Chicago, Illinois	Clarence E. Deakins, Dean of Students
Illinois State Normal University	Normal, Illinois	R. H. Linkins
Illinois, University of	Urbana, Illinois	Fred H. Turner, Dean of Students
Illinois Wesleyan Univ.	Bloomington, Illinois	
Indiana University	Bloomington, Indiana	R. L. Shoemaker, Dean of Students
Iowa State College	Ames, Iowa	M. D. Helser
Iowa, State	Iowa City, Iowa	L. Dale Faunce, Dean of Students
		Marion L. Huit
Kalamazoo College	Kalamazoo, Michigan	Raymond L. Hightower
Kansas State College	Manhattan, Kansas	William G. Craig, Dean of Students
Kansas State Teachers College	Emporia, Kansas	Victor T. Trusler
Kansas State Teachers College	Pittsburg, Kansas	Eugene Dawson, Dean of Students
Kansas, University of	Lawrence, Kansas	Laurence C. Woodruff
Kent State University	Kent, Ohio	R. E. Manchester
Kentucky, Univ. of	Lexington, Kentucky	A. D. Kirwan
Knox College	Galesburg, Illinois	W. Lyle Willhite, Dean of Students
Lafayette College	Easton, Pennsylvania	Frank R. Hunt
Lake Forest College	Lake Forest, Illinois	
Lawrence College	Appleton, Wisconsin	George Walter
Lehigh University	Bethlehem, Pa.	Wray H. Congdon, Dean of Students
Lewis and Clark College	Portland, Oregon	Vergil Fogdall
Louisiana State Univ.	Baton Rouge, La.	Arden O. French
Louisville, Univ. of	Louisville, Ky.	Dave Lawrence
Loyola University of New Orleans	New Orleans, La.	Anthony C. O'Flynn, S. J.
Loyola Univ. of Los Angeles	Los Angeles, California	Frank Parrish
Maine, University of	Orono, Maine	John E. Stewart
Marshall College	Huntington, W. Va.	Darold Shutt
Maryland, Univ. of	College Park, Md.	Geary Eppley, Director of Student Welfare
Massachusetts Insti- tute of Technology	Cambridge, Mass.	E. Francis Bowditch, Dean of Students
		T. P. Pitre

Massachusetts, Univ. of	Amherst, Mass.	Robert S. Hopkins, Jr.
Mercer University	Macon, Georgia	Richard C. Burts, Jr.
Miami University	Oxford, Ohio	Robert Miner, Director of Student Affairs
		W. E. Alderman, Dean of Col. of Arts & Sciences
Miami, Univ. of	Coral Gables, Fla.	Foster E. Alter
Michigan State College	East Lansing, Mich.	Tom King, Dean of Stud.
Michigan, Univ. of	Ann Arbor, Michigan	Erich A. Walter, Dean of Students
		W. B. Rea, Assoc. Dean
Middlebury College	Middlebury, Vermont	W. Storrs Lee, Dean of Students
Minnesota, Univ. of	Minneapolis, Minn.	E. G. Williamson, Dean of Students
Mississippi Southern College	Hattiesburg, Miss.	R. G. Lowrey, Dean of Student Welfare
Mississippi, Univ. of	University, Miss.	R. Malcolm Guess
Missouri, Univ. of	Columbia, Missouri	Jack Matthews, Dean of Students
Montana State College	Bozeman, Montana	H. G. Klemme
Montana State Univ.	Missoula, Montana	Herbert J. Wunderlich, Dean of Students (Clifton S. Jackson Northern Montana Col- lege, Havre, Montana)
Montclair State Teachers College	Montclair, N. J.	Earl C. Davis, Dir. of Student Personnel
Moravian College	Bethlehem, Pa.	Roy D. Hassler
Muhlenberg College	Allentown, Pa.	Sherwood R. Mercer
Nebraska, Univ. of	Lincoln, Nebraska	T. J. Thompson, Dean of Student Affairs
Nebraska Wesleyan Univ.	Lincoln, Nebraska	Clinton B. Gass
Nevada, University of	Reno, Nevada	R. S. Griffin
Newark College of Engineering	Newark, N. J.	Frank A. Grammer
New Hampshire, Univ. of	Durham, N. H.	William A. Medesy
New Mexico, Univ. of	Albuquerque, N.Mex.	Howard V. Mathany
New York University	New York, N. Y.	William Bush Baer, Dean of University
North Carolina State College	Raleigh, N. C.	Ed L. Cloyd, Dean of Students
North Carolina, University of	Chapel Hill, North Carolina	Fred H. Weaver, Dean of Students
North Dakota Agricul- tural College	Fargo, North Dakota	C. A. Sevrinson
North Dakota, University of	Grand Forks, North Dakota	Donald J. Robertson, Dean of Stud. Affairs

Northeastern University	Boston, Mass.	Harold W. Melvin, Dean of Students
Northern Illinois State Teachers College	DeKalb, Illinois	Ernest E. Hanson
Northwestern State College	Natchitoches, La.	Carl W. Knox, Asst. Dean
Northwestern University	Evanston, Illinois	Dudley G. Fulton, Dir. of Student Relations
		F. George Seulberger
Oberlin College	Oberlin, Ohio	E. F. Bosworth
Ohio State University	Columbus, Ohio	Joseph A. Park
		William S. Guthrie, Junior Dean
Ohio University	Athens, Ohio	Maurel Hunkins
		Philip L. Peterson, Associate Dean
Ohio Wesleyan Univ.	Delaware, Ohio	J. J. Somerville
Oklahoma A. & M. College	Stillwater, Okla.	R. R. Oglesby, Dean of Students
Oklahoma Baptist Univ.	Shawnee, Oklahoma	Lee Bowen Spencer
Oklahoma City Univ.	Oklahoma City, Okla.	George H. Ryden
Oklahoma, Univ. of	Norman, Oklahoma	Paul MacMinn, Dean of Students
		O. D. Roberts, Counselor of Men
Omaha, University of	Omaha, Nebraska	John W. Lucas, Dean of Students
Oregon, University of	Eugene, Oregon	Donald M. DuShane, Director of Student Affairs
		N. Ray Hawk
Pacific, College of the	Stockton, Calif.	Edward S. Betz
Park College	Parkville, Missouri	President J.L. Zwingle
Parsons College	Fairfield, Iowa	Philip E. Young, Dean of Students
Pennsylvania State College	State College, Pennsylvania	H. K. Wilson
		Daniel A. DeMarino, Assistant Dean
Pittsburgh, Univ. of	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Theodore W. Biddle
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn	Brooklyn, New York	Henry Q. Middendorf, Dean of Students
Princeton University	Princeton, N. J.	Francis R. B. Godolphin
Principia, The	Elsah, Illinois	Garner E. Hubbell
Puerto Rico, Univ. of	Mayaguez, Puerto Rico	Jose A. Franceschini, Dir. of Student Service
Purdue University	Lafayette, Indiana	Don Mallett, Director of Student Affairs

Redlands, Univ. of	Redlands, Calif.	Marc Jack Smith
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	Troy, New York	Richard A. Waite, Jr.
Rhode Island, Univ. of	Kingston, R. I.	John F. Quinn
Rice Institute, The	Houston, Texas	Guy T. McBride, Dean of Students
Ripon College	Ripon, Wisconsin	Morris Quint
Rochester, Univ. of	Rochester, N. Y.	Philip Price, Director
Rollins College	Winter Park, Florida	
Rutgers University	New Brunswick, N.J.	Cornelius B. Boocock
		Edgar G. Curtin, Associate Dean
San Jose State College	San Jose, Calif.	Stanley Benz
Santa Barbara College	Santa Barbara, Cal.	Lyle G. Reynolds
St. Lawrence Univ.	Canton, New York	George K. Brown
St. Olaf College	Northfield, Minn.	Carl Swanson
South Carolina, Univ. of	Columbia, S. C.	J. B. Jackson
South Dakota, Univ. of	Vermillion, S. Dak.	R. H. Knapp
Southeastern La. Col.	Hammond, La.	L. E. Chandler
Southern California, University of	Los Angeles, California	Bernard L. Hyink, Dean of Students
Southern Ill. Univ.	Carbondale, Ill.	I. Clark Davis
Southern Methodist University	Dallas, Texas	Francis P. Gaines, Jr., Dean of Students
Southwestern Louisiana Institute	Lafayette, La.	E. Glynn Abel
Stanford University	Stanford University, California	H. Donald Winbigler, Dean of Students
State Teachers College	Platteville, Wis.	John H. Wooldridge
Stetson Univ., John B.	DeLand, Florida	Benson W. Davis
Stevens Institute of Technology	Hoboken, N. J.	Waldo Shumway
Swarthmore College	Swarthmore, Pa.	Everett Hunt
Syracuse University	Syracuse, N. Y.	Frank Piskor (2)
Taylor University	Upland, Indiana	C. C. Decker, Director of Personnel
Temple University	Philadelphia, Pa.	
Tennessee, Univ. of	Knoxville, Tenn.	R. E. Dunford
Texas College of Arts and Industries	Kingsville, Texas	
Texas Technological College	Lubbock, Texas	James G. Allen
Texas, University of	Austin, Texas	Arno Nowotny, Dean of Student Life
		Jack Holland
Toledo, University of	Toledo, Ohio	Donald S. Parks, Personnel Director

Tulane University	New Orleans, La.	John H. Stibbs, Dean of Students
Tulsa, University of	Tulsa 4, Okla.	Edgar Smith, Counselor of Men
Union College	Lincoln, Nebraska	M. S. Culver
Union College	Schenectady, N. Y.	C. W. Huntley
Uppsala College	East Orange, N. J.	Harold R. Sundberg, Acting Dean of Men
Utah State Agricultural College	Logan Utah	Daryl Chase, Dean of Students
Utah, University of	Salt Lake City 1, Utah	John L. Ballif, Jr.
Valparaiso University	Valparaiso, Ind.	Marshall J. Jox, Dean of Student Personnel
Vanderbilt University	Nashville, Tenn.	Robert S. Waldrop, Dean of Students Albert S. Thompson, Chief of Counselors
Vermont, Univ. of	Burlington, Vt.	Robert H. Kroepsch
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	Blacksburg, Va.	Robert E. Bates, Director of Student Affairs
Virginia, Univ. of	Charlottesville, Virginia	Richard R. Fletcher, Dir. of Student Affairs
Washington and Lee University	Lexington, Va.	Frank J. Gilliam, Dean of Students
Washington, State College of	Pullman, Washington	Norman E. Lange, Assoc. Dean of Students
Washington Univ.	St. Louis, Missouri	Arno J. Haack, Director of Student Affairs
Washington, Univ. of	Seattle, Washington	Glen T. Nygreen, Exec. Officer of Stud. Aff.
Wayne University	Detroit, Mich.	Victor F. Spathelf, Dean of Student Affairs
Western Reserve University	Cleveland, Ohio	Russell A. Griffin, Dean of Students
Western Michigan College of Education	Kalamazoo, Mich.	Ray C. Pellett
West Virginia University	Morgantown, W. Va.	Joseph C. Gluck
Wheaton College	Wheaton, Ill.	Charles C. Brooks, Dean of Students
William and Mary, College of	Williamsburg, Va.	John E. Hocutt
Wisconsin, Univ. of	Madison, Wisconsin	Kenneth Little, Vice Pres. of Student Aff.
Wittenberg College	Springfield, Ohio	John N. Stauffer, Dean of Students

Wooster, College of
Wyoming, Univ. of

Wooster, Ohio
Laramie, Wyoming

Ralph A. Young
A. L. Keeney

Yale College

New Haven,
Connecticut

Richard C. Carroll,
Dean of Students

HONORARY MEMBER

Mr. H. Roe Bartle, 1023 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Missouri

EMERITUS DEANS

S. E. Crowe, Michigan State College, East Lansing, Michigan

B. C. Daly, Box 755, Laramie, Wyoming

A. D. Enyart, Rollins College, Winter Park, Florida

Floyd Field, 2685 Tupelo Street, S. E., Atlanta 3, Georgia

Scott H. Goodnight, 4310 Cherokee Drive, Madison 5, Wisconsin

T. T. Jones, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky

Fraser Metzger, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey
